

For a decade we have had troops or military associations in a Europe running from Turkey on the east to Italy on the south and France on the west. But have we dominated any of those countries? Charles de Gaulle of France would hardly prove so. For American foreign policy has been as notably unsuccessful in dominating General De Gaulle as it has been in dominating Chancellor Adenauer or the Turks or the Italians or the Belgians or any of the others.

And where and when have we used a foreign base or lodgment to assault another nation? How many times has the Soviet Union done so since the Second World War? Half a dozen? More like a like a dozen?

If the after-allers are even partly right, what is the moral justification for foreign aid, for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and all the rest? And what of our long record, backed by unbroken history, of seeking no territory, no conquest? If we are, indeed, to be measured alongside the Soviet Union by our own voices what is the use of anything at all?

The after-all logic comes to this: Here, after all, are two giant powers. If we have the right to maintain foreign bases, though our bases are maintained with the consent and on the eager appeal of the host nations, then so does the Soviet Union, even though its bases are maintained at gunpoint and in some instances over the dead bodies of the host nations.

If this is objectivity, so then is the epigram which says that the rich and poor have an equal right to sleep in the public parks.

What price the objectivity, say of a Chester Bowles, a Presidential adviser who says we must not attack a Cuba infected with Soviet military communism because we should then be charged in the United Nations by the Russians with "blatant aggression and very likely they (the Russians) would win their case?"

The naked right of self-defense cannot possibly be alerted by any such mere Alice-in-Wonderland propaganda "case" in the U.N. or elsewhere.

There are only two possible excuses for not putting a stop right now to Soviet penetration. One is the official judgment that as of now we are not directly menaced. The other is the estimate, on which President Kennedy is banking, that the job can be done through collective pan-American action. Because he is President, his judgments must be accepted now; because there can be only one President at a time and because only a President can either know all of the facts or act upon them, anyhow.

But if his judgments turn out wrong, and wrong because of any heed paid to the after-allers, there will be measureless tragedy for his administration and for this country.

COUNTY GOVERNMENTS IN CALIFORNIA ADVANCE FOUR-POINT PROGRAM FOR LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the responsibility of local elected officials to advance the economic well-being of their own areas is fundamental in American Government. This sense of local service and responsibility has been demonstrated by nine northern California counties whose boards of supervisors have proposed a program of action to relieve the plight of the lumber industry upon which these counties so heavily depend.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman last week met with Congressman HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON, Democrat, of California, whose mountain district contains 12.5 million acres of national for-

est, and with Michael T. Hennessy of Yreka, representing the Northern California Supervisors Association. The secretary reviewed the basic four-point program advocated by the nine county governments and pledged the Department's full cooperation. The four points are:

First. Sale of full allowable cut of timber based on sound inventories and growth prediction.

Second. Consideration of community stability in appraising timber for sales.

Third. Revision of Forest Service contracts to make them more equitable to the public, the timber purchaser, and the Forest Service.

Fourth. Adoption of an independent appeals procedure to permit speedy settlement of contract disputes.

I endorse this program. It is important to note that the nine counties—Siskiyou, Plumas, Butte, Glenn, Modoc, Lassen, Tehama, Shasta, and Trinity—produce most of the timber harvested on national forests in California.

Mr. President, their resolutions reflect the genuine interest of local government in an attempt to solve their own problems. The one presented by Siskiyou County is typical. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION TO SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ON PROPOSALS OF THE LUMBER INDUSTRY

Whereas an increasingly large segment of the lumber industry has become substantially dependent upon the Federal Government for its source of timber supply; and

Whereas recent trends in Federal timber sales procedures are resulting in more and more instability in such lumber industry; and

Whereas as representatives of the people of this county, the board of supervisors is vitally interested in the lumber industry in order to bring about economic stability to the communities of this county: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of supervisors of Siskiyou County, That the Secretary of Agriculture be urged to immediately adopt the four point program presented to the Secretary of Agriculture on February 21, 1962, by the representatives of the lumber industry as supplemented and more particularized by the memorandum to the Secretary of Agriculture further expanding such four point proposal made August 9, 1962.

The clerk is directed to mail additional copies of this resolution to the two U.S. Senators of this State and to the Congressman from this district.

Passed this 28th day of August 1962, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Ager, Barr, Jackson and Ealy.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

DON S. AVERY,

Chairman of the Board of Supervisors.

Attest:

RACHAEL N. CORDES,

DISARMAMENT—ARTICLES BY REPRESENTATIVE GALLAGHER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would also like to call attention to three articles by Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey. Representative GALLAGHER recently spent 12 days in

Geneva as adviser to the U.S. Delegation to the Disarmament Conference. These three articles recently appeared in New Jersey newspapers and I commend them to my colleagues for analysis and study. They represent a concise summary of the status of negotiations in Geneva.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENEVA DISARMAMENT TALKS MAY DECIDE SURVIVAL OF WORLD

(By Congressman CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Member, Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives and Adviser to U.S. Delegation on Disarmament)

Nothing is more vital to the security of the United States and the entire world than a workable, realistic, and guaranteed nuclear disarmament treaty between the major nuclear powers.

I have recently returned from the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, where I served as adviser to the U.S. delegation on disarmament. As an original sponsor of the legislation creating the U.S. Arms Control Agency, my job was to evaluate the Conference proceedings and report back to the Congress with my recommendations.

In the light of my observations at the Conference and conversations with Secretary Rusk, I want to report to you here, and in subsequent columns, on our country's efforts to achieve a guaranteed system of nuclear disarmament.

I believe the Geneva Disarmament Conference is the most important international conference to be held this year. The recent news that the Conference will take a temporary recess from September 8 to November 12 has been interpreted by some observers as a sign that the Conference has reached a total deadlock. This is a misconception. A temporary recess has been planned for some time to permit Conference delegates who are also delegates to the U.N. to attend the opening sessions of the U.N. General Assembly this fall.

Some people feel that the establishment of the U.S. Arms Control Agency was a sign of weakness. There are many people today who view the talks now going on in Geneva as a sign of weakness. I could not disagree more. The creation of the agency and the continuation of the talks are manifestations of our strength and maturity.

If we are to prevent an incineration of the world some day it will come about only because an agreement was reached on nuclear disarmament.

I am not talking of thoughtless, irresponsible, unilateral disarming. I am speaking of a disarmament agreement carefully considered and honorably entered into by all the nations of the world.

As the Secretary told the Conference, "our goal is perhaps the most ambitious, but certainly, it is the most essential, of all the items on the agenda of mankind. The United States considers that progress in disarmament is a practical goal and a practical necessity. I can assure you that no government is more anxious than the Government of the United States to assume the responsibilities which go with the drafting, the signature, and the execution of a sound and safeguarded treaty on general and complete disarmament."

The Russians, for their part, say they want peace and an end to the arms race, but so far they have shown little disposition to join us in an objectively controlled and reasonable reduction in arms or even in securing an end to nuclear testing. It was the Soviet Union, after all, which first re-

and protected it with a Constitution. That is why it is so appropriate that the Baronial Order of Magna Carta is holding its services today in this historic church.

Magna Carta was wrested by the barons and knights of England from King John at Runnymede, on the 15th day of June 1215. It is not generally known, but Magna Carta was an 18-inch-square sheepskin document which was unsealed, not signed, because neither the King nor any of the nobles could write. Magna Carta has been universally recognized as the bulwark of English liberties. The most important grant of liberties in this great charter was: "No Freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or be depossessed of his Freehold, or Liberties, or free Customs, or be outlawed, or exiled, or any otherwise destroyed; nor will we not pass upon him, nor condemn him, but by lawful Judgment of his Peers, or by the Law of the Land. We will sell to no man, we will not deny to any man either Justice or Right."

Magna Carta did not create new and novel rights.

It was in essence a recognition and restoration of certain rights and liberties which had previously been enjoyed by the nobles of England, but which had been usurped and abrogated by King John. It was the inspiration and basis for our Declaration of Independence and for the inherent rights of private property and the fundamental freedoms which were ordained and established in our Constitution. These included freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right of private property, and the right to trial by jury. Moreover, Magna Carta was the first written acknowledgment by the Crown that the people (the nobles) had certain inherent inalienable rights and that the Crown was subject to the law. In other words, that the power of sovereignty or government was limited. This concept of limited government is the essence of our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The Baronial Order of Magna Charta was established to perpetuate the memory of those ancestral noblemen who in that charter finally secured from the King a recognition and guarantee of their important liberties and their basic rights of property; and to inspire their descendants with an indestructible determination to perpetuate these fundamental rights of freedom and property.

Freedom of any kind is not easily secured or easily maintained. The almost-divine flame of freedom is flickering in atheistic Russia and its Communist satellites in Europe, in China, and in our next-door neighbor, Cuba—but it never dies. Today in many parts of the world, in several new nations in Africa, in southeast Asia, and in smoldering nations in South America, freedom is erupting and shining more brightly than ever before.

Our Constitution, in spite of many criticisms today, has been proclaimed by world leaders, as the greatest document ever written in the last 1,900 years. It not only guarantees numerous fundamental liberties, but it further provides that no man shall be deprived of his property or liberty except by a law which is passed by his Representatives in Congress or in a State legislature, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. These inherent fundamental rights of private property, of freedom of religion, speech and press, and the right to trial by jury, are the basic rights which distinguish a really free people from atheistic communism and from other nations which are ruled by an omnipotent dictator.

Magna Carta was also the first important written recognition and partial settlement of the endless struggle which has gone on through history, and which I believe will

continue perpetually, between an absolute dictator or an omnipotent government on the one hand—regardless of what euphemistic and false name it adopts—and freedom-loving people on the other. This struggle, this battle, like the tides of the sea, constantly ebbs and flows.

It is surprising how many people fail to realize this endless struggle and the importance and necessity of preserving these fundamental basic pillars on which the house of freedom has been erected. Unbeknown to most people, a craving for absolute governmental power has insidiously invaded our beloved country.

Our Constitution is not a weathervane which turns with every popular wind that blows; our Constitution is a rock of Gibraltar, which was built to give a free people a wise framework of limited government and to protect our constitutionally ordained rights of property and our liberties against infringement—even against hurricane winds generated by demands of selfish groups or by self-seeking politicians, or even by those with worthy objectives. You cannot swear to support and obey the Constitution; you cannot say that you are for the Constitution if you attempt to erode or bypass or distort or destroy a part of the Constitution when it restrains your present wishes or interests.

Today every expansion of Government, and every curtailment of rights of private property and of freedom of speech or press, is advocated and proclaimed under the guise, often sincerely made, that it is for the general welfare and in the best interest of the people, and hence government should possess and exercise this power. This is a very popular cloak with which to conceal infringements of basic constitutional rights. It is unpopular to oppose any government action, whether advocated by the highest officer in the land or by the lowest zoning commission, when they constantly assert, accompanied with a righteous glow, that their plans and actions and policies are for the benefit of the people.

Yet if we are to preserve our fundamental rights, which were ordained in Magna Carta and in the Constitution, we must oppose each and every sugar-coated invasion and curtailment of these basic rights. I vigorously urge the Baronial Order of Magna Charta to be as vigilant and indestructibly steadfast as were their ancestors in opposing the expansion of governmental power when it curtails the inherent rights of free men, even though the governmental acts be gilded with a heart-warming slogan or a (misdirected) worthy goal.

The Baronial Order of Magna Carta can be helpful in another important way. It is well known that Magna Carta resulted from a revolt of the Nobles, but it is not as well known that the church, through the efforts of Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, was part of this movement. The Magna Carta provides that the Church of England "shall have her whole rights and liberties inviolable." King John had persecuted the clergy and had appropriated church lands, and in this way had filled his coffers with money which he needed for pleasure and for war. John was excommunicated, but after several years he made peace with the Pope, his excommunication was withdrawn, the church's property was returned, and the church's sovereignty over England was recognized in Magna Carta.

Today, mainly because of the cold war, people throughout the world are so worried, harried, poor, or hungry, that they have become extraordinarily materialistic, and are worshipping Mammon instead of God. Here in this wonderful historic church, all of us should rededicate ourselves not only to protecting and perpetuating the fundamental

rights of freedom and private property which were established in Magna Carta and ordained in our Constitution, but even more important the higher power which is above all temporal power, namely, the love of church and the love of God. May I reverently say "Let your light shine forth throughout our city, State, and Nation, so that all men may see your good works and be inspired to protect our liberties and glorify our God."

Cuba
U.S. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an excellent editorial by William S. White in the September 19 issue of the Washington Evening Star. This editorial discusses a common fallacy that often enters into our discussion of the explosive Cuban situation. The fallacy is the facile parallels sometimes drawn between U.S. bases overseas and Communist colonialist expansion.

The assumption that U.S. military bases in other countries and Soviet military outposts are in some way identical is dangerously wrong. Such an assumption is based on the inability, or the refusal, to see a difference in the respective goals of the United States and the U.S.S.R. The assumption also points to a misunderstanding of the role of military forces in a democratic society and in a totalitarian, colonialist society. We should recognize that our purposes are to let the free world remain free. The purposes of the U.S.S.R., on the other hand, are to turn the free world toward Communist slavery.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. White's editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BEWARE "AFTER-ALL" VIEW ON CUBA—RATIONALIZING OF THE SOVIETS' TAKE-OVER WITH FREE WORLD'S BASES IS FOUND FAULTY

(By William S. White)

A curious line is running through much public and private comment about the presence in Castro Cuba of Soviet arms and Soviet technicians. It might be called the argument of after-all, and it goes thus:

It is very upsetting, of course, that the Soviet Union has now made a publicly boasted military lodgment in this hemisphere. But, after all, the United States has forces of its own or allies of its own in many places confronting Russia, too.

Of this sort of reasoning the only possible query is how sophisticated, how objective, can you get? Isn't this another way of saying that there is, underneath, not much difference between us and our record and intentions and the Soviet Union and its record and intentions?

Is there no distinction between the positioning of American forces in free countries which have asked for our protection and the positioning of Soviet forces in countries which have been brutally and simply overrun—say Hungary and Poland?

We have troops in West Germany, yes. But is West Germany under our rule as East Germany is under Nikita Khrushchev's rule? President Kennedy, whose whole administration has been involved in endless and often losing arguments with Chancellor Adenauer, would hardly say so.

have to be paid in Cambodia and the rest of Southeast Asia.

2. In the Suez crisis, in 1956, the United States intervened against the action taken by Britain and France in behalf of the whole free world. The principal beneficiary of that rash intervention, Dictator Nasser, has been repaying the West by atrociously discriminating against its shipping interests, a great gain for Moscow.

3. Because French interests in the Middle East are large and compelling, both Washington and London had given assurances that France would be consulted in advance on all policy decisions during the Lebanon crisis in 1958. Yet France was demonstratively ignored by the Anglo-American Governments before they acted.

4. In the grueling 7-year war in Algeria, France found neither understanding nor diplomatic help in Washington. On the contrary, she had to contend with ever-mounting American moral support for the rebels.

5. Most important, because it reflected a false and deeply humiliating underestimation of the country, the United States has denied to France the kind of access to the reservoir of American nuclear technology that was wide open to Great Britain. This illogical policy, which persists to this day, has given the ring of hypocrisy to our lip service to French equality in the grand coalition.

LOST FAITH

Any of these events and policies may be explained, or explained away; there is room for argument. But their total impact on the French people, during long years of tragedy and sacrifice, has been to erode faith in the free world alliance. For all the talk of free world unity against international communism, they felt increasingly, France must depend in the long run on its own power and wisdom. Her exclusion from the nuclear elite has been a prime factor in this national sentiment.

As long ago as August 19, 1958, we warned in these columns that France "will continue to react sharply, to its own and the free world's peril, to every maneuver of disparagement or downgrading. And in this connection the atomic problem is crucial. Nuclear energy for both peaceful and military uses has become the symbol and substance of strength in today's world. France has no alternative but to reach out for it."

Reach out for it France did, and successfully. Already she has exploded a number of atom bombs, without a single failure. By any test of reality, France now qualifies for admission to the nuclear club, even as defined under American laws that admitted Britain to full membership. Soviet Russia happens to be right in regarding France as a nuclear power, despite American assumptions to the contrary.

But while Britain was able to draw on American know-how and industrial production in the nuclear area, France has been forced to shoulder the immense burdens of duplicating what was already available in the United States. As we wrote in the past, "France will attain atomic vitality commensurate with her needs and her place in the hierarchy of nations. How much better that this be done with our generous cooperation."

FOLLY UPON FOLLY

A current episode points up the absurdity as well as the injustice of the continued denial of nuclear equality to France. The French Government is seeking to purchase in our country certain equipment related to the production of the delivery system for its atomic bombs. Neither nuclear nor atomic secrets are involved in these machines, and machine tools. The American manufacturers are eager to fill the large orders

which, incidentally, would be helpful to the United States in its balance-of-payments difficulties.

If Washington turns thumbs down on the purchases—apparently a decision is still pending—France may again be forced to erect her own factories to produce such equipment. She will be put to great expense and frustrating delay in achieving the nuclear force to which she is entitled and which she will attain eventually in any case.

In theory, American nuclear weapons are available to protect French interests against a common enemy. In light of the events summed up above, however, France can scarcely be blamed for refusing to stake its destiny wholly on the judgments of others.

The French people have been deeply hurt and saddened by the international ill winds blowing against them. Now they are torn in soul and flesh by the Algerian tragedy. Though the nation has made an all but miraculous economic recovery, its people are discontented. They feel that they have been crowded into a go-it-alone corner by the uncooperative policies of their main allies.

THE SENSE OF BELONGING

Unless this condition is rapidly cured, unless France becomes a full partner in the Alliance, the French position may harden into a species of isolationism, with dire consequences both for herself and the free world. The ambiguity of the French role in NATO may lead to a complete alienation again with disastrous results for the entire free world.

More than ever before, France needs a stabilizing sense of belonging to the Atlantic Community. More than ever before, the true unity of the free world must be confirmed and fortified. And the primary responsibility rests with Washington. We have no alternatives in logic, or in terms of rockbottom self-interest, but to recognize that France, by its own efforts and despite American indifference, now ranks as a nuclear power.

We must face up to this reality with deeds which the French people cannot misunderstand. The immediate result would be a great lift to the morale not only of France but of the whole free world coalition in this time of crowding Communist challenge.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

(Mr. ROSENTHAL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a table.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I support foreign aid. I subscribe to the principles of our foreign assistance programs and have cast my vote in favor of the administration's recommendations for authority and appropriations in this essential field. But I reserve the privilege, which I would now exercise, of registering disagreement with some of the ways in which our foreign aid programs are administered around the world.

Previously, I criticized the provision in the foreign aid bill expressing our Government's official displeasure with those nations that discriminate against American citizens because of their race, color, or religion. That statutory provision did not achieve the desired end of discrimination by the Arab States and the Arab League against Americans of Jewish faith. The language was therefore strengthened this year to require the President henceforth to report to Con-

gress his progress in requiring the Arab nations that are beneficiaries of our aid to cease their extensive boycotting and blacklisting activities against American citizens and American business firms. For the moment, I am satisfied to wait to see whether this legislative language will produce results.

Currently I am concerned, however, that in allocating aid to various nations the officials of our Government do not appear to take into consideration the extent to which the recipient nations are accepting military aid from the Sino-Soviet bloc. I have communicated my concern to the Department of State, which has furnished me with the following illustrative statistics:

A comparison of U.S. foreign aid to less-developed countries with military aid extended to those countries by the Sino-Soviet bloc

(Millions of U.S. dollars)

Country	U.S. economic and technical assistance commitments mid 1955-December 1961	Estimated Sino-Soviet bloc military aid mid 1955-December 1960
Indonesia.....	308	506
Iraq.....	13	188
Syrian Arab Republic.....	69	128
United Arab Republic.....	394	315
Yemen.....	19	17

We should be careful in interpreting the meaning of these statistics. In the words of the Department's spokesman:

"As you are aware, unclassified data concerning Sino-Soviet bloc military aid is very limited and general in nature. The figures for bloc military aid which we have listed in the enclosed table represent only approximate estimates derived from published reports of shipments of Sino-Soviet bloc military equipment, or from announcements of agreements to provide military aid to less-developed free world countries. Estimates of the value of bloc arms shipments are necessarily very tenuous, even when official figures are released by the bloc or the recipient country, because of lack of information on discounts and price reductions on various items and the amount of aid extended in grant form. The difficulty of fixing a true market value, in U.S. dollars, also inhibits precise estimates."

The assumption on which we furnish economic assistance to other nations, it seems to me, is that they lack sufficient capital and other resources to develop their economy to the point at which they can begin developing their own economic surplus which can be applied for further capital formation and economic growth. It is my understanding that, in theory, we analyze the economy of each country in minute detail to be sure that it lacks sufficient resources of its own and to satisfy ourselves that it is making best use of the limited resource that it does possess.

As we make that theoretical country-by-country analysis, we naturally take into consideration the extent to which

the recipient nation allocates its limited resources for military purposes. We recognize that support of military forces is a diversion of economic resources from the economic development of the country. It may be required by the Nation's strategic and political exigencies, but allocating scarce resources to military purposes tends to retard rather than hasten economic advance.

What are we to believe, then, when we find nations accepting armaments from the Sino-Soviet nations that are valued at two, three, or a dozen times as much as they receive from us for peaceful purposes? If Syria can absorb and make use of \$128 million in Sino-Soviet armaments, are we acting wisely in extending \$69 million in economic assistance? How serious is Syria in its professed desire to progress economically and achieve a better life for its people if it takes from behind the Iron Curtain nearly twice as much in arms as it finds itself able to utilize from our bounty for peaceful purposes?

I advance these opinions, Mr. Chairman, because I wish my colleagues and the responsible officials of the executive branch to reflect upon them. Should we not require the administrators of foreign economic assistance to take into consideration the extent to which a recipient nation is diverting its resources to utilize armaments received from the Sino-Soviet bloc? Does not acceptance of such arms in large quantities at least presumptively impugn to some extent the professed ambition of the recipient nation to attain economic development? Should not our considerable influence be exerted wherever possible to persuade the nations of the world that rising per capita incomes are the true measures of national stature, not impressive arrays of military might?

Cuba

CUBA

(Mr. ALFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a resolution.)

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, on all sides, from all over America, we hear a clamor for a solution to the terrifying situation that confronts us in Cuba. Committees of this Congress are struggling with the problem, attempting to find a solution.

Mr. Speaker, the true solution to this problem lies within the immediate grasp of the House of Representatives. It is incorporated in House Concurrent Resolution 223, which I introduced on April 25, 1961, and which still is pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This resolution is simplicity itself. It declares that it is the sense of Congress that immediate and effective action is necessary for the protection and the life of our American nations, and for the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine.

This priceless and historic Doctrine has not been abrogated. It stands in full force and effect today just as it did more than a century ago. All that is demanded is that it be enforced.

That Members of the House may be refreshed, I insert this resolution at this

point in the RECORD, and I urge its immediate adoption:

H. CON. RES. 223

Whereas the conditions that have long obtained in our near neighbor, Cuba, in recent years, and which are now critically acute, constitute an ever mounting danger and menace to our own and sister countries of the Western Hemisphere at the hands of communistic influence and sanguinary power which, if permitted to continue, will destroy every vestige of free and representative government in these nations, and lead to the complete dominance by the most brutal despotism the world has ever known; and

Whereas these communistic activities are clear-cut and intended violations of the Monroe Doctrine; and of the various declarations and historic policies of these nations on the subject of foreign efforts to penetrate and assume power in this hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States of America that immediate and effective action is necessary for the protection and the life of our American nations, and for the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine;

Sec. 2. That to these ends all our American governments should forthwith unite, in line with their traditional policies and treaty obligations, to repel these monstrous forces of evil, and to employ whatever means may be necessary, military or otherwise; and

Sec. 3. That we fully support the President of the United States of America in his recent statements touching these matters, with the pledge that we shall give him effective cooperation in doing whatever is necessary to be done—in concert with the other affected nations, or by the United States alone, if the emergency so requires—in line with the principles and practices of the Monroe Doctrine.

A CENTURY OF EMANCIPATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 3 hours.

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to commemorate an important anniversary in the history of the Republic, the Emancipation Proclamation, which was issued 100 years ago, Saturday of this week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGL] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Emancipation Proclamation was the greatest single stroke for liberty in the long history of mankind.

Saturday we will mark the passage of 100 eventful years since that tall, worried, harried man from Illinois set his pen to a document that marked a beginning in the long struggle man has waged in the cause of freedom. Abraham Lincoln had long before determined that when the proper time came, he would indeed strike the chains from a

large segment of his fellow men by the exercising of a part of the tremendous power that goes with the office of the President of the United States. He had set that determination on the record for all mankind to see clearly.

Just 4 years before, during that historic series of debates in which he had engaged with Stephen A. Douglas, speaking at Alton, Ill., October 15, 1858, Abraham Lincoln had said in part the following:

[The right and wrong of slavery.] That is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time, and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity, and the other the "divine right of kings." It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, "You work and toil and earn bread and I'll eat it." No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an excuse for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the mind of Abraham Lincoln was determined even then to strike down this principle, and all he sought was the time and the method to best accomplish this end. Many of Lincoln's leading supporters in the presidential campaign of 1860 expected Lincoln to emancipate the slaves immediately. Lincoln waited. In waiting he subjected himself to constant pressure and much unwarranted abuse from those very supporters for not taking this step.

In the 80-some years separating the American Revolution from the Civil War, the United States had become wedded and tied to, enmeshed with and saturated in the slavery institution. It is true that half the Nation rejected slavery early in our national history. But even the half—the Northern half—had made no move to prevent the existence of slavery in the South, and many northerners always been sympathetic to the cause of slavery. When Jefferson proposed the ordinance of 1786, forbidding the extension of slavery into any of the Territories, a good number of northern Congressmen combined their votes with those of southern Congressmen to kill the proposal, thereby permitting the spread of slavery as far north as St. Louis and as far west as Texas.

Northern acceptance of slavery in the South permitted the expansion and lengthy existence of two national parties—Whig and Democratic—neither of which had a word of approbation for the slavery institution. There was anti-slavery sentiment around, of course—but not very much of it was especially vigorous, and that which was vigorous was exceedingly unpopular. Up in Boston, William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips were hard at work, enlisting a handful of antislavery radicals, opposed to the existence of slavery anywhere in the United States. So extreme was their position, however, that they failed to

The result of increased investments in small business through the SBIC's is an increase in national productivity and employment as well as the fulfillment of the primary consideration of helping small business place itself in a better competitive position.

I know of one specific instance which especially demonstrates the value of the program. Until recently, the Defense Department had only one major source from which to purchase a highly important component item. A small firm capable of producing the item was unable to compete for the contract because of inadequate capital. An SBIC, after studying the small firm's potential, agreed to provide the needed financing and the small business is now a competitive bidder and has been supplying a substantial part of the Defense Department's need. By providing a small firm with the means to become competitive and to survive, this SBIC contributed not solely to the welfare of this particular business, but also to the elimination of a sole source procurement situation.

I have cited this specific SBIC investment because I think it is an excellent example of both the direct and the indirect advantages that flow throughout our economy from the maintenance of a strong and healthy small business community.

When equity capital is needed and is not available, the trend of small firms is toward consolidation with competitors or with a big business. It is my hope that the SBIC program will slow down and perhaps even reverse this trend and help small concerns to preserve their identity and continue as a significant force in the American economy.

As the Small Business Committee stated in its most recent annual report, a primary factor in the success of the program has been and will continue to be the flexibility of the act under which this type of financing can be provided. There's not only flexibility in the methods of providing assistance to small concerns but provision has been made for the SBIC industry to serve all segments of the small business community.

The needs of small business are vastly different. A small retailer, for example, may require \$20,000 to \$30,000 in long-term credit for the expansion which will enable him to grow and prosper; whereas, a small manufacturer competing with the giants of American industry may have just as great a need for \$2 to \$3 million in equity capital for plant expansion and equipment.

There is a vast difference between the needs of these two members of the small business community but small they are and survive they must if our free enterprise system is to function as it should.

BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES OF NATIONS ALLIED WITH THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD WAR II

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War II. My amendment would make benefits available to a person who served in active service in the armed forces of any government allied with the United States in World War II who has been a lawful resident of the United States for at least 10 years, and who during such service was a member of forces which actually participated in armed conflict against an enemy of the United States. Such a

person would derive benefits—as hospital and domiciliary care and medical services—to the same extent as if his service had been performed in the Armed Forces of the United States.

I have studied the treatment accorded to similar war veterans in other countries. For instance, the British Royal Air Force Benevolent Fund gives able and extensive assistance to former members, and their dependents, of the two Polish fighter squadrons which fought with the RAF against the Luftwaffe in the Battle of Britain. The members of these squadrons escaped from the near-total destruction by Hitler of the Polish armed forces, made their way to France and ultimately to England, finally to perform distinguished service for the RAF. The Benevolent Fund of the RAF now provides grants and loans to those in need of assistance, makes interest-free loans to those in need of money to buy tools, and helps obtain employment to those out of work. In this way, the British people show their gratitude to those who fought for Britain.

Investigation shows a pressing need for legislation dealing with this problem in our country. Thousands of brave men of different nationalities served the goals of the free world in the Second World War. The Polish people were especially notable for their exemplary bravery and service. After the hostilities had ended, many of these distinguished soldiers came to the United States. Here, together with their families, they hoped to rebuild their lives and salvage the dreams the war had reduced to rubble. Financial reward cannot exhaust our gratitude. But it could make the lives of these brave men a bit easier.

Mr. President, the United States has always been proud of its tradition of faithfulness to friends. I now ask that those who fought for the principles which we hold most dear now be assisted by passage of this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3738) to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War II, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had concurred in the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 1960) to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the United States district courts, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House had concurred in the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R.

11970) to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. KEOGH, Mr. MASON, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. BAKER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 9943. An act for the relief of Stella McKee;

H.R. 12082. An act to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; and

H.R. 13067. An act to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act with respect to the authority of the Federal Housing Commissioner to pay certain real property taxes and to make payments in lieu of real property taxes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 9943. An act for the relief of Stella McKee; and

H.R. 12082. An act to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 20, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 4. An act to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore;

S. 149. An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich;

S. 319. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide that the provisions of section 4(I) thereof, relating to long- and short-haul charges, shall not apply to express companies;

S. 1161. An act to provide for the use of lands in the Garrison Dam project by the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation;

S. 1307. An act to amend section 128 of title 28, United States Code, to constitute Richland, Wash., a place of holding court for the eastern district of Washington, southern division, and to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington, Southern Division, holding court at Richland, Wash.;

S. 1924. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868) with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah;

S. 2357. An act to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia;

S. 2511. An act to provide for the production and distribution of educational and training films for use by deaf persons, and for other purposes;

S. 2696. An act to correct certain land descriptions in the act entitled "An act to declare that the United States hold in trust for the pueblos of Santa Ana, Zia, Jemez, San Felipe, Santo Domingo, Cochiti, Isleta, and San Ildefonso certain public domain lands";

S. 2971. An act to declare that certain lands of the United States are held by the United States in trust for the Jicarilla Apache Tribe of the Jicarilla Reservation;

S. 3086. An act to provide for a reduction in the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 3154. An act to amend Public Law 88-184, an act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State;

S. 3315. An act to relieve owners of abutting property from certain assessments in connection with the repair of alleys and sidewalks in the District of Columbia;

S. 3317. An act to amend the provisions of law relating to personal property coming into the custody of the property clerk, Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; and

S. 3580. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Article entitled "The Monroe Doctrine is Still Alive," written by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps (retired), Director of National Security and Foreign Affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Article entitled "U.S. Strategy in No. 1 Danger Area," written by Maj. Gen. Max S. Johnson (Ret.), published in the U.S. News & World Report of September 17, 1962.

Article entitled "European Unity: The Different Political Goals," written by Robert C. Doty, published in the New York Times on September 16, 1962; an article entitled "European Unity: Economic Problems," written by Seth S. King, published in the New York Times on September 16, 1962.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial entitled "Russian Roulette," written by Rev. A. McKay Brabham, Jr., editor, published in the South Carolina Methodist Advocate.

Editorial relating to Robert Soblen, broadcast on radio station WGAC in Augusta, Ga.

Editorial entitled "J. L. Sims," published in the State, Columbia, S.C., on September 19, 1962; editorial entitled "Death Was Not a Stranger," published in the Columbia, S.C., Record on September 18, 1962; editorial entitled "J. L. Sims," published in the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., on September 16, 1962; an article entitled "J. L. Sims, T. & D. Publisher, 'Dies,'" published in the Times & Democrat, Orangeburg, S.C., on September 15, 1962.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Defeat on the Great Lakes: U.S. Ships, Mines Lose Out," written by Leo J. Hertz, published in the Milwaukee, Wis., Journal on September 16, 1962.

U.S. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the resolution on Cuba unanimously reported by the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. In my opinion, this resolution, in clear

and candid terms, states the correct position for our country to take with respect to the troubled conditions in that Caribbean island 90 miles from our shores.

All Americans must feel anger and frustration at the situation in Cuba. Castro's Communist subversion of the Cuban revolution has hoisted a Red flag within sight of our shores. I share the common concern about the recent arrival of Soviet technicians and weapons, both Mig fighters and short-range missiles. Khrushchev's insulting warnings to the United States have raised everyone's blood pressure.

But in this situation there is a heavy obligation on those of us in public office to help our Nation keep events in perspective; to avoid aggravating a tense international problem with cheap, rash talk for political gain.

This is no time for war hawks. This is no time to call for the imposition of a naval blockade, in itself an act of war. This is no time for garrulous old men to deal lightly with the lives of young men whom they might send to war.

I repudiate the belligerent, irresponsible, demagogic talk, and I support wholeheartedly the pending resolution—a resolution supporting the intelligent position of the President of the United States, which has been brought forward by the combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees.

I hope it will be unanimously adopted by the Senate, and thus state in unmistakable terms our national will and desire to protect the interests of freedom in our hemisphere, and at the same time to repudiate the unwarranted, irresponsible and belligerent efforts of many to force the United States of America into an unwanted and unneeded war in violation of solemn treaty obligations against unilateral acts of intervention.

I am happy to state my position in support of the policy of drawing a cordon sanitaire around Cuba and thus protecting the effort of our Latin American allies to maintain their freedom with our support.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Without going into details on the joint resolution, as to which I expect to have something to say later in the afternoon, the Senate is about to consider some so-called maritime bills today.

Mr. CLARK. So I have heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have all been working to preserve the American merchant marine in many ways. There are many ways in which we can tackle the problem with respect to which the joint resolution will deal.

I should like to quote from a UPI dispatch which appeared in the morning newspaper:

Two Italian freighters loaded with Russian goods for Cuba remained tied up in port today because crew members refused to continue the trip.

The reference is to a port in Italy.

Port sources said the tieup could worsen this week when two more ships carrying Russian goods to Cuba are due.

I make the suggestion that all the so-called NATO countries which are engaged in this struggle with us against the Russian ideology, which is so repugnant to us, which has now spread its ugly ramifications into Cuba, if they are sincere in regard to the effort—I am sure they are, and I do not question it—could take the same action. They can see what at least a few Italians have done in regard to the blockade of Cuba. I call upon the maritime nations which belong to NATO to take a good long look at this procedure, because it could be very effective.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his helpful interjection. I, too, commend the action by the Italian crews.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that shipping interests in other NATO countries will exhibit a similar desire.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

THE CHICAGO & NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY STRIKE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, President Kennedy's dilemma over what to do next about the strike against the Chicago & North Western Railway is a very real one, and until he faces up to the action it compels he is impaled squarely on its horns.

His tortuous path along the rocky road of labor disputes is well lighted by two editorials recently appearing in the New York Times and the Chicago Sun-Times. They ask the obvious question, "Why, Mr. President?"

Why do we see firm action by the President to back up his extra-legal board in the aerospace industry, a board whose findings were favorable to labor, and then have him avoid, like the smallpox, the findings of the statutory board in the Chicago & North Western Railway strike, a legally authorized board, whose findings are opposed by labor?

In the aerospace strike he said, "Management, get in line or take the consequences for halting our missile program." In the railway strike, the board recommendations having been ignored, the President says "make concessions."

Mr. President, the Chicago & North Western strike is surrounded with despair. Beet farmers either ship their beets or end up broke. Farm produce, merchandise of every kind, and even commuters, must move. If they do not, the slump in the Midwest's economy will make the stock market slump almost as palatable as a yacht race on a sunny afternoon.

Labor experts doubt that the injunctive relief contained in the Taft-Hartley Act covers this railway strike. If we disagree, and believe it can be employed, use it. If Taft-Hartley does not seem to apply, recommend to leaders in the Congress its incorporation in the Railway Labor Act.

Another expedient available, is the bill S. 794, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on February 6,

September 20

The award will be formally presented to Senator MAGNUSON at NDTA's 17th annual transportation and logistics forum which will be held in San Francisco, October 28-31. Actual presentation of the award will take place during the association's annual banquet the evening of October 31 in San Francisco's Sheraton-Palace Hotel.

The citation accompanying the award said that Senator MAGNUSON, during his career in Congress, "has been particularly active and effective in the field of transportation legislation bearing upon all modes of transportation."

"In his capacity as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he has constantly and consistently led the way in endeavors designed to enhance and to improve our national transportation system throughout. His successful efforts range through the Magnuson-Monroney aid to airports bill, the Federal Aviation Act, congressional approval of the International Rail and Highway Commission studies, development of the world's first nuclear-propelled merchant ship, the *N.S. Savannah*; the world's first oceangoing hydrofoil vessel, the *H.S. Denison*; the Transportation Act of 1958, and most recently the report developed under his guidance, as a result of Senate Resolution No. 29 of the 86th Congress.

"His inspiring leadership and enthusiasm, sturdy principles and progressive spirit, and his valuable and noteworthy service in the cause of transportation preparedness have merited for him the respect of the entire transportation world," the citation concluded.

Born in Moorhead, Clay County, Minn., April 12, 1905, Senator MAGNUSON came to Washington, D.C., January 1937, as a Member of the House of Representatives from Seattle, Wash., where he served until assuming his Senate seat on December 13, 1944. He now ranks 9th among Democrats and 11th in seniority in the membership of the Senate of the 87th Congress.

Senator MAGNUSON holds important positions in the Senate for the advancement of his and the Nation's transportation objectives.

He is chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce and chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which weighs the funding needs of 29 Government agencies, including all regulatory agencies and of the Federal Aviation Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Office of Emergency Planning.

Senator MAGNUSON is also a member of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, chairman of the Standing Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and of the Special Subcommittee to Study Operation of the Military Air Transport Service and the Military Sea Transportation Service, chairman of the Special Subcommittee to Study Methods of Advancing Foreign Trade Between the United States and Asia, and Between the United States and Canada and Iceland.

In addition, Senator MAGNUSON is the recognized spokesman for transportation in the nine-member Senate Democratic policy committee on which he serves, and he heads the Congressional Board of Visitors to both the U.S. Coast Guard Academy and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

OTHER AWARD WINNERS

Senator MAGNUSON, as the 1961 winner of the National Transportation Award, heads a list of many transportation-field leaders who have been honored in previous years. They include Morris Forgash, chairman of the board and president of the United States Freight Co., selected as the 1960 winner for sparking industrywide interest in a basic set of standards and dimensions of transporta-

tion equipment; Stephen D. Bechtel, Sr., 1959 winner, selected for his strengthening of transportation facilities through engineering and construction, mainly in the building of oil and natural gas pipeline systems; Robert G. LeTourneau, 1958, for his development of heavy-duty handling, hauling, and loading equipment; William T. Farley, 1957, for his efforts to strengthen transportation as a leader of the Association of American Railroads; Donald J. Russell, 1956, for his contribution to the solution of emergency transportation problems; Donald W. Douglas, Sr., 1955, for his work in both military and civilian transportation, and Charles H. Weaver, 1954, for the design and construction of the nuclear powerplant for the submarine *Nautilus*.

The National Defense Transportation Association, a military-civilian group of transportation professionals established the National Transportation Award in 1949 to promote transportation preparedness and to foster a keener realization of military transportation requirements.

SENATOR TO DELIVER MAJOR ADDRESS
OCTOBER 31

Senator MAGNUSON is expected to deliver a major transportation message when he speaks to NDTA delegates at their annual banquet.

MAGNA CARTA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Baronial Order of Magna Charta is a highly esteemed, patriotic organization, with its headquarters in Philadelphia. Its members are to be found in the various States of the Union—many of them in Pennsylvania. The sureties of Magna Carta were the barons and nobles chosen to see to it that the English King did nothing to stay or destroy the liberties granted under the famous Document of Runnymede, approved in 1215.

Every year the annual meeting of the officers and members of the order is held usually in Philadelphia or its environs. These meetings are usually held at the home of members; and a feature involved is the display of the banners of the original sureties. Weather permitting, the dinner that is served is on the lawn of the host. These occasions are well attended; and the wives and daughters of the members lend the "eloquence of their presence." The annual meeting falls on a Saturday in the early summer, at which business is transacted, and the social aspects observed.

On the day following the annual meeting, Sunday, a Magna Carta service is held in Old Christ Church, in the heart of Philadelphia, and an address is delivered, concerning Magna Carta, by an outstanding publicist. The banners of the ancient sureties are carried in the church procession. Following the service the order makes bestowal of its annual award of merit on the speaker.

The last annual meeting of the order occurred June 16, 1962, at the home of Charles Edgar Hires, former marshal—chief officer of the order—in Bryn Mawr, in Metropolitan Philadelphia. The meeting is designated the annual grand chapter. Col. Thomas R. White, Jr., is the present marshal.

An interesting feature of this meeting was the election of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as an honorary life member of the order. He is eligible for membership under his ancestral lines. The motion for

this action was made by former Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, a member of the order and on its governing board of sureties.

On the next day, June 17, at the Magna Carta service held in Christ Church, Hon. John C. Bell, Jr., chief justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, was the speaker, and he delivered a most interesting and patriotic address. Following its delivery, Justice Bell was presented with the order's annual award of merit for outstanding public service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for inclusion of this excellent address in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS OF JOHN C. BELL, JR., CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT CHRIST CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 17, 1962

We are gathered today to celebrate the 747th anniversary of one of the greatest and probably the most famous document in English history, the Magna Charta. It is particularly appropriate that these commemorative services should be held in Philadelphia, the city which is the birthplace of liberty, and in Christ Church, because it is probably the most famous church in our country. This historic church is rich in tradition, glorious in its spirituality, and wonderful in the influence which it has exerted in Philadelphia and on the Founding Fathers of our Nation. It was chartered by the Bishop of London in 1695, upon petition of 36 persons, including physicians, lawyers, carpenters, a baker, a dyer, a judge of the Admiralty, and two "pirates." It was the first Church of England parish in this colony, and thus the mother church of the diocese of Pennsylvania. It was a shrine of American patriots during Revolutionary times, and especially when the Declaration of Independence was being drafted and signed, and the Constitution was adopted. George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and many other leaders of our country worshipped at Christ Church and many of them are buried here.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was formed in Christ Church after the Revolution, and William White, who was its outstanding rector for 57 years, was not only chaplain of the Continental Congress, but also became the first bishop of Pennsylvania.

Its spiritual leadership has been combined with temporal leadership and works of charity and benevolence. Through the influence of members of its congregation, four churches in nearby counties have been established, as was the University of Pennsylvania, the Episcopal Academy, and the Philadelphia Divinity School. After 260 years since its founding, Christ Church has lost nothing of its spirituality and its dynamic activity as a church and parish. Its parish groups and organizations are constantly aiding the poor, the helpless and the needy, and spreading the Kingdom of God at home and abroad. Its fame and historic appeal is evident from the fact that some 175,000 people visit Christ Church every year, and of this number approximately 50,000 are schoolchildren, scouts and young people.

Our ancestors who founded America, believed that God created men in equality and willed them to be free in body, spirit and soul. Our forefathers crossed 3,000 miles of a wild unknown ocean and gave up security, in order to live and worship in freedom. In words and in deeds they proclaimed their belief in God, and in freedom from any absolute temporal ruler. They proclaimed this in the Declaration of Independence, they established it by a revolution, and they ordained

Union done so since the Second World War? Half-a-dozen? More like a dozen?

If the afterallers are even partly right, what is the moral justification for foreign aid, for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and all the rest? And what of our long record, backed by unbroken history, of seeking no territory, no conquest? If we are, indeed, to be measured alongside the Soviet Union by our own voices what is the use of anything at all?

The afterall logic comes to this: Here, afterall, are two giant powers. If we have the right to maintain foreign bases, though our bases are maintained with the consent and on the eager appeal of the host nations, then so does the Soviet Union, even though its bases are maintained at gunpoint and in some instances over the dead bodies of the host nations.

If this is objectivity, so then is the epigram which says that the rich and poor have an equal right to sleep in the public parks.

What price the objectivity, say of a Chester Bowles, a presidential adviser who says we must not attack a Cuba infected with Soviet military communism because we should then be charged in the United Nations by the Russians with blatant aggression and very likely they (the Russians) would win their case?

The naked right of self-defense cannot possibly be alerted by any such mere Alice-in-Wonderland propaganda case in the U.N. or elsewhere.

There are only two possible excuses for not putting a stop right now to Soviet penetration. One is the official judgment that as of now we are not directly menaced. The other is the estimate, on which President Kennedy is banking, that the job can be done through collective Pan American action. Because he is President, his judgments must be accepted now; because there can be only one President at a time and because only a President can either know all of the facts or act upon them, anyhow.

But if his judgments turn out wrong, and wrong because of any heed paid to the afterallers, there will be measureless tragedy for his administration and for this country.

U.S. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, there is a seething bitterness among the American people today. They watch the ugly contemptible situation in a Communist-dominated island located 90 miles off the American coastline. They are filled with a bitterness perhaps unparalleled in modern times at the Soviet Union's making of Cuba a Communist power in this hemisphere.

That feeling is shared by the people's representatives in this Chamber. Shortly the U.S. Senate, in my judgment, will unanimously pass Senate Joint Resolution 230, which yesterday was reported to the Senate unanimously by both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 230) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety"; and

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that "an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations"; and

Whereas the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 declared: "The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extra-continental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union"; and

Whereas the international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States is determined—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the passage of the joint resolution will demonstrate that the American people are united behind the President of the United States. The passage of the joint resolution will demonstrate that the Congress of the United States, the American people's representatives, reconfirm in the President the responsibility which under the Constitution is his, to take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate in the defense not alone of the American people, but in the defense also of freedom in the Western Hemisphere; and to prevent any attempted exportation of communism by Cuba, or the Soviet Union, or any Communist power, into any part of this hemisphere.

I am, as an American and not a partisan, most grateful and proud of what our two committees have done. I look forward to demonstrating with my vote, in conjunction with the votes of every Democrat and every Republican in this Chamber, the fact that the American people and the American Government intend to see that communism does not constitute a growing cancer in the Western Hemisphere. Firmness in our policy against Communist imperialism must be an unflinching American position any place in this globe where the threat arises.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself, in case the time limitation might not allow all of us to say what we would like to say on Cuba and on the joint resolution, with the remarks made by the Senator from California and by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Apparently Senators are united on this issue, regardless of political party. Apparently we are all united in the belief that Castro must go. We are dedicated to that proposition, whether we be Republicans or Democrats.

I think the best illustration of that fact for the American people, as Americans rather than Republicans or Democrats, is what is taking place in the Senate today. The distinguished Senator from California is a Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate in a State, a neighbor to mine. I am a Democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate in my State. We are both united in believing that Castro must go, and we shall be dedicated to that proposition.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, an article in the September-October 1962 issue of the National Defense Transportation Journal paid high tribute to Senator MAGNUSON and observed that he had been selected by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Department of Defense to receive the thirteenth annual National Transportation Award of the National Defense Transportation Association. The award will be presented to Senator MAGNUSON on October 31, 1962. The citation accompanying the award stated, among other things:

His inspiring leadership and enthusiasm, sturdy principles and progressive spirit, and his valuable and noteworthy service in the cause of transportation preparedness have merited for him the respect of the entire transportation world.

Mr. President, the recognition accorded Senator MAGNUSON by this award is richly deserved. In both Houses of the Congress and on both sides of the aisle no one would dispute that he is Mr. Maritime.

Mr. President, whether the mode of travel or cargo shipment is over water, on the surface or in the air, I believe there is no man in Congress who has been more dedicated to, or contributed more, to the achieving and realization by our country of the most modern and efficient transport system in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR MAGNUSON WINS TRANSPORTATION AWARD

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington State, has been selected by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Department of Defense to receive the 13th annual National Transportation Award of the National Defense Transportation Association. His selection was based on achievements in transportation which "contributed to the effectiveness of the transportation industry in support of national security."

in President Kennedy's word. It is that the public discussion has grown too narrow, making it sound as though the United States had only two choices: Either do nothing at all about the Soviet occupation of Cuba, or else immediately mount a military invasion to take over the island.

The President himself leaves this implication. His stated policy is to do nothing at present, but to act boldly at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba endangers or interferes with the security of the United States or its hemispheric allies.

It may be that these black-and-white alternatives are the only ones left. After all, the United States has already used up a lot of economic and political weapons. It cut Castro off from Cuba's prime sugar market; it embargoed exports to Cuba of everything but some food and medicine; it succeeded in getting a somewhat grudging denunciation of Castro from the Organization of American States and his exclusion from the Inter-American Defense Board.

Still, today's either/or atmosphere obviously encourages the proponents of each alternative—those eager to rush into Cuba without further ado, and those who don't want the United States to fight anywhere for anything. And this atmosphere deters people from taking thought to see if there are any other possible ways for dealing with this expanding Soviet base on our doorstep.

Certainly some other possibilities exist, whether or not they necessarily represent wise courses for the United States. One would be an attempt to force the Soviet hand in Cuba by applying pressure elsewhere, as for example curbing trade with the Soviet bloc. Similarly, there could be diplomatic pressures, including breaking relations with the Soviet Union.

Or, to confine the response to Soviet Cuba itself, the United States could tell the Kremlin that unless it voluntarily stops shipping arms and men to Cuba, the United States will do the stopping. If they refused, that would of course mean a blockade as far as all military shipments to or from Cuba are concerned.

Now a blockade is a military act but it is not of itself war. If the Soviets refrained from making it an occasion of war, then the effect would be to isolate Cuba. The Soviets would still have their base but it wouldn't do them much good. In such circumstances Castro and Cuban communism might or might not collapse from economic strangulation, but at least we would have neutralized the threat to our security.

Or the United States could go further and tell the Soviets to get out of Cuba altogether if they don't want to be evicted. Again, a course clearly risking strong Soviet reaction. Yet it might be remembered that the Soviets have always backed down in the face of Western firmness; even the Korean war probably would not have occurred had not the Soviets thought the sailing was clear. In the case of Cuba, military experts think it extremely doubtful that the Soviets would fight for it; there is too much against them, and its intrinsic importance may not be all that great to them.

We cite these courses not in advocacy but to suggest there still is ground between total inaction and a precipitate plunge into Cuba. Words, it is clear, are not enough.

Right after the Bay of Pigs debacle a year ago April, President Kennedy had strong words to say about our course in Cuba; so did he last week. Yet in the interim the Soviets have secured and greatly strengthened their Caribbean base with no opposition from the United States.

If the United States continues to appear weak and lets the Soviets move about the Western Hemisphere with impunity, there is no telling how far they will go. That is why we think the public discussion, not to

mention Government planning, should center on all possible ways of ending the Soviet immunity.

[From Life magazine, Sept. 21, 1962]

WHAT SHOULD MONROE DOCTRINE MEAN? BLOCKADE

Khrushchev's arms buildup in Cuba is an insolent challenge to the Western Hemisphere which has so far drawn no adequate response from the President of the United States. The White House is wrapped in what appears to be indecision. A measure of indecision is understandable, for we have been skillfully ambushed by Khrushchev. But the President must act, and we urge him to invoke the Monroe Doctrine, a foundation stone of U.S. foreign policy, to prevent Castro's further import of Communist arms.

What has happened to the Monroe Doctrine? When Khrushchev pronounced it "dead" 2 years ago Eisenhower denied it and so has Kennedy. But Khrushchev is evidently trying to prove it dead or to find out what it means. Being unilateral, the Doctrine has always meant just what the United States says it means, including what kind of "colonization" it is intended to forbid. But to mean anything to Khrushchev, the doctrine needs a fresh definition of the kind the United States will risk a fight for. Kennedy owes the world that clarification.

In his statement admitting the Cuban buildup Kennedy said it is not yet a serious military threat to the United States. He made a distinction (hardly tenable) between offensive and defensive weapons, implying that a continued buildup will raise the "gravest issues"—that is, issues of U.S. preventive action. We suggest that the issue is sufficiently grave already; that the presence of massive Soviet arms and soldiers in this hemisphere is hostile to the Monroe Doctrine, and that it should be specifically defined to exclude them. Russian arms have turned Cuba into a Russian colony as abject as East Germany. If not yet a threat to the continental United States, they are such to the harassed governments of Venezuela, Guatemala, Honduras and several other members of our hemisphere security system, not to mention our Marine base at Guantanamo or the Panama Canal. And they are a political threat to the U.S. position as a world power.

How then can Kennedy stop further Communist arms to Cuba and make an updated Monroe Doctrine stick? He has taken some first steps. He is bringing pressure on our NATO allies not to let their ships be chartered for this traffic. Dean Rusk has proposed an informal meeting of Western Hemisphere foreign ministers to discuss possible OAS action. Moreover, Kennedy has promised to continue helping Caribbean nations patrol their shores against arms smuggled from Cuba.

These steps are not enough. The next one, we suggest, is that the U.S. Navy, with whatever Latin American support we can muster, stop and search all vessels, especially Soviet vessels, entering Cuban waters and suspected of carrying more Soviet arms or men. The men would be sent home, the arms dumped in the sea.

Rusk has discouraged a blockade talk on the ground that it would be an act of war. But a blockade against armaments is less warlike than Khrushchev's massive arming of Castro. It is less bellicose than Khrushchev's irresponsible rodomontade of last week, in which he accused the United States of plotting an invasion of Cuba and threatened nuclear war. An arms blockade—although it may mean war—is not necessarily a formal act of war, especially if the 139-year-old Monroe Doctrine is interpreted to require it.

In so interpreting it, we must of course seek assent from our Latin allies, with whom we have increasingly shared responsibility

for the doctrine's definition since 1933. But we have not surrendered this responsibility; the Latins are inclined to evade it; and our whole hemisphere security system depends in the last analysis on U.S. power. Said Kennedy last year: "If the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration * * * this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are to the security of our Nation."

It is true that U.S. interests and security are now global, not merely hemispheric. Kennedy himself seems unduly impressed with Khrushchev's argument that if we support NATO bases near Russia's Turkish border, why can't Russia have bases in our backyard? Though our interests are global, we have a prior commitment to this hemisphere; and there is no law telling us we must not resist aggression until our declared enemy is as worldwide as we.

The Soviet buildup near Florida is the most direct challenge to the Monroe Doctrine since Maximilian invaded Mexico. The reassertion of the doctrine against this threat will reassure our uneasy allies and put spine in the inter-American system. Above all, it will let Khrushchev know that Kennedy, who once said, "Our restraint is not inexhaustible," is not the victim of permanent indecision. A blockade has its dangers, including that of physical sailor-to-sailor contact with the enemy, though the conflict will remain as limited as Khrushchev desires. There is far greater danger in continued piecemeal acceptance of the worldwide Communist advance.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 19, 1962]

BEWARE "AFTER ALL" VIEW ON CUBA—RATIONALIZING OF THE SOVIETS' TAKEOVER WITH FREE WORLD'S BASES IS FOUND FAULTY

(By William S. White)

A curious line is running through much public and private comment about the presence in Castro Cuba of Soviet arms and Soviet "technicians." It might be called the argument of after all, and it goes thus:

It is very upsetting, of course, that the Soviet Union has now made a publicly boasted military lodgment in this hemisphere. But, after all, the United States has forces of its own or allies of its own in many places confronting Russia, too.

Of this sort of reasoning the only possible query is how "sophisticated," how "objective," can you get? Isn't this another way of saying that there is, underneath, not much difference between us and our record and intentions and the Soviet Union and its record and intentions?

Is there no distinction between the positioning of American forces in free countries which have asked for our protection and the positioning of Soviet forces in countries which have been brutally and simply overrun—say Hungary and Poland?

We have troops in West Germany, yes. But is West Germany under our rule as East Germany is under Nikita Khrushchev's rule? President Kennedy, whose whole administration has been involved in endless and often losing arguments with Chancellor Adenauer, would hardly say so.

For a decade we have had troops or military associations in a Europe running from Turkey on the east to Italy on the south and France on the west. But have we dominated any of those countries? Charles de Gaulle of France would hardly prove so. For American foreign policy has been as notably unsuccessful in dominating General de Gaulle as it has been in dominating Chancellor Adenauer or the Turks or the Italians or the Belgians or any of the others.

And where and when have we used a foreign base or lodgment to assault another nation? How many times has the Soviet

ment tells us that we must wait until the Communists can do us real harm before action is taken. Meanwhile, nothing is to be done to prevent this threat from arising. Even though history has conclusively demonstrated that the Communists appreciate and respond only to firm, resolute action, the administration proposes that instead we give the Reds an uninterrupted diet of weakness and vacillation.

As a substitute for a meaningful policy, an attempt has been made by the administration to divert attention from the very real crisis in Cuba. On the one hand we are told that Berlin is the real problem, not Cuba, and by implication that we should not worry much about the Castro government and the Soviet military buildup in Cuba. Inspired leaks were given to the press by administration spokesmen espousing this peculiar dogma which maintains that if we have two problems, we should only worry about one.

WE MUST FACE UP TO CUBA OR LOSE ALL LATIN AMERICA

Even though it is most embarrassing to the administration we must direct our attention to Cuba and to Latin America as well as to Berlin. The fact remains that our present policy toward Cuba is an open invitation for further Communist inroads in Latin America. They have seen the administration panic at the Bay of Pigs, and they see our present indecisive timidity. We are, therefore, driving them toward an active anti-American neutralism, if not outright collaboration with the Communists. As the Latin American expert for the Washington Daily News, Virginia Prewett, observed in an article on September 17:

President Kennedy's announced determination to act against Castro only if Russia makes Cuba strong enough to attack the United States or Latin America militarily is inviting the anti-American mice out to play throughout the hemisphere.

As a result, Latin America is rapidly slipping toward anti-U.S. neutralism or pro-Communist control without the firing of a single shot by Castro.

In conclusion she says:

President Kennedy's limited defense of Cuba is inviting our hemisphere opposition to boil furiously, while we are a noncontender.

This same theme was developed in a Wall Street Journal editorial for September 18:

If the the United States continues to appear weak and lets the Soviets move about the Western Hemisphere with impunity, there is no telling how far they will go. That is why we think the public discussion, not to mention Government planning, should center on all possible ways of ending the Soviet immunity.

I shall ask unanimous consent that both of these articles appear in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The United States is, therefore, consigned to a role of "noncontender" while administration policies invite our hemisphere opposition to move away from us while the Soviets move about the Western Hemisphere with impunity.

On the other hand, another effort to divert attention from Cuba has been made by the New Frontier. President Kennedy's special adviser on African and Asian affairs, Chester Bowles, managed to build a magnificent strawman in a speech given, with White House blessing, on September 16. Instead of presenting a firm, workable policy toward Cuba, he attacked those who are concerned about the utter lack of such a program. He clearly implied that all those who have such a concern advocate an outright invasion of Cuba and that the only alternative to invasion is a continuation of the present do-nothing policy. This may be a neat debating trick, but it will not fool the American people. We know that there are many other things that can be done, many alternatives available. If these are the only two choices that can be dreamed up by administration spokesmen, it is little wonder that our policy toward Cuba has been so disastrous.

In summary, then, the administration policy has been one of reaction, not action; brave words without brave action; statements that the Monroe Doctrine still is our policy without implementing it; this, coupled with attempts to divert attention from Cuba and the crisis facing Latin America by creating strawmen and by saying we should look only at Berlin and not Cuba. Of course we must look to Berlin, but we must also face up to the Cuban threat immediately.

A PROGRAM OF ACTION

The present situation calls for firm action. We should immediately meet with the Organization of American States in an effort to obtain a concerted economic and political quarantine of Cuba. We must demand that our NATO allies, including Canada, must stop shipping military hardware in NATO-owned vessels or in planes that are permitted to land in NATO countries on the way to Cuba. Russia and Cuba must be immediately advised that the military buildup in Cuba must stop and that Russian military personnel must leave the country. We should also give our full support to the Cuban freedom fighters. If these efforts fail, then the United States should promptly apply a blockade against Cuba. We can do nothing less if we wish to stop a Communist takeover of other Central and Latin American countries and if we wish to stop the remainder of the countries from concluding that the United States is an irresolute ally which, because of fear and timidity, is unwilling to protect its national interests and the interests of the Western Hemisphere.

Immediate action is vital; further delay will be fatal. The American people are waiting for the President to lead. He will have their unwavering support if he acts now and decisively.

Since I prepared this speech there have been two excellent comments on the Cuban situation, one in a Life editorial and the other written by the noted columnist William S. White. I ask unanimous consent that these, along with the two articles previously mentioned, may be printed in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 17, 1962]

WE'RE FACING DISASTER IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By Virginia Prewett)

President Kennedy's announced determination to act against Castro only if Russia makes Cuba strong enough to attack the United States or Latin America militarily is inviting the anti-American mice out to play throughout the hemisphere.

As a result, Latin America is rapidly slipping toward anti-U.S. neutralism or pro-Communist control without the firing of a single shot by Castro.

The Organization of American States, our hemisphere defense system, is being nibbled to death.

Haiti, with two Communist cabinet ministers, recently warned the OAS it's preparing charges against the Dominican Republic. Informants say Haiti will accuse its Dominican neighbor of plotting an invasion.

Haiti is thus generating counterpressure for Moscow against the Dominican Republic, since the Dominicans are pushing charges in the OAS that Cuba is inciting subversion in their country. The United States is trying to get the Republic started in self-government after 30 years of Trujillo dictatorship.

Bolivia, which has a Communist Vice President, recently bolted the OAS. The trumped up excuse is a dispute with Chile over use of the River Lauca waters. This argument, bumbling along for years, was only lately blown up as a reason for disrupting the OAS.

BRAZIL SLIPPING

Brazil, already "neutralist," is slipping deeper into the power of President Joao Goulart's anti-American associates. Senor Goulart has maneuvered his supporters into top army commands, but civil war is still a possibility.

Senor Goulart's triumphal visit to the United States last April rescued his then tottering prestige and fostered his power drive.

Argentina, only 2 years ago a showcase of recovery with the cooperation of U.S. private and public capital, has been economically shattered by the upsurge of totalitarian Peronism aided by communism.

Peronism and communism are manipulating labor. Huge packing plants and textile factories are closed, with slowdowns in other industries. Millions of letters are undelivered in paralyzed post offices. Newspapers are reduced to skeletonized forms. The Government is 2 months behind in paying civil servants.

DIVIDED

While the Peronist-Communist combination gathers momentum from Russia's strong play in Cuba, antitotalitarian forces are divided, disoriented, virtually leaderless.

Central America's "President" Louis Somoza of Nicaragua has just warned that U.S. inaction against communism in Cuba may "force" Latin Americans into the Soviet bloc. This hints that President Somoza, who inherited a family dictatorship but is now being pressured to democratize his country, may soon start playing the Communists against the United States.

President Kennedy's limited defense on Cuba is inviting our hemisphere opposition to boil furiously, while we are a noncontender.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 18, 1962]

THE SOVIETS' IMMUNITY

The trouble with a lot of the talk about Cuba, it seems to us, is not that it is "rash,"

1961, to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Railway Labor Act. Hearings were held on this bill in the 86th Congress with no final action and the current bill has been before the Senate for 19 months. It contains a quick and reasonable remedy. It will protect the rights of all parties.

Mr. President, earlier this week, in the matter of a relatively few hours, this body passed the most comprehensive and far-reaching trade bill ever passed by any Congress. Under it, we have given authority exceeding that ever before given a Chief Executive of this great Nation. Our demands are given great weight. Whatever we need to cope with the railway strike will, I am sure, be promptly ours for the asking.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD various editorials on the subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Omaha (Nebr.) World Herald, Sept. 15, 1962]

SUGAR IN THE FIELDS

The Chicago & North Western strike, which has idled the Nation's third largest railroad, has inflicted widespread economic hardship. Sugarbeet producers, particularly, are threatened with considerable loss.

Sugarbeets have no value except in the processing of sugar, and the only place they can be processed into sugar is in a sugar factory, which in many cases is a considerable distance from the beet fields. The period of time between the maturity of sugarbeets and the start of freezing weather normally is a short one. Rapid and orderly transportation of the crop is essential. Beet producers feel that if they don't have the crop moving in volume by October 1, their financial loss may be heavy.

The Federal Government has made routine efforts at conciliation. The White House has issued the usual expressions of concern. But freight cars stand idle and rails rust. We imagine that some of the sugarbeet producers may wish that President Kennedy would perform with some of the firepower he displayed when the steel companies tried to raise prices. But that—as yet, at least—is not the way the ball bounces.

[From the Madison (Wis.) State Journal, Sept. 17, 1962]

CONCESSIONS, IF THAT IS THE WORD

President Kennedy's highly original suggestions on how to end the Chicago & North Western Railway strike should interest Midwest farmers whose sugar beets may rot in the fields and Wisconsin paper mill workers now jobless because of the tieup.

"I am hopeful that both sides will make sufficient concessions, if that is the word, to permit an agreement," said the President at his news conference last week.

What concessions, exactly, does the White House have in mind by the North Western management?

It already is on record as pledging that telegraphers shifted to lower paid jobs would get the difference in pay for 5 years; that those laid off would get 60 percent of their old pay for 3 to 5 years, even if working at other jobs; that those required to move would have their moving costs paid, and guaranteed against loss in sale of their homes; that retraining would be offered the furloughed (laid off) workers; that pension and hospitalization benefits would be continued for the part-pay period.

These offers by the railroad, made before the strike began and restated since, would seem to most Americans as about as far as an employer can reasonably go in protecting workers it no longer needs and can no longer afford.

The telegraphers insist that they are not demanding a "job freeze" or a veto over management rights to hire only the men it needs. Yet their refusal to consider the North Western offer belies their protest. And the fact that neither Mr. Goldberg nor his successor, Mr. Wirtz, even once criticized the North Western refusal to make a new offer is pretty good evidence that the original offer was fair.

Mr. Kennedy thinks that "both sides" should make new concessions to end a costly and senseless strike. His proposal is about as nonpolitical as his trips to open new dams and inspect missile plants.

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum and Moorhead (N. Dak.) News, Sept. 7, 1962]

JOB SECURITY BIG ISSUE IN NORTH WESTERN STRIKE

The strike of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers against the Chicago & North Western Railway does not involve any dispute over wages or hours, but it relates solely to job security.

It is a disturbing problem not only for the participants, but for the public, particularly to the public in the States through which the railroad runs. The railroad had to close down operations since other railroad unions would not cross the picket lines.

The railroads of the country are in difficult times. Faced with increasing competition from other carriers, they have found that under their type of setup and the Federal and State controls over them, some way must be discovered to get their properties back on paying basis. That is why they have been talking mergers. It is why they have been trying to find ways to economize—they know they must find ways. There have been railroad heads who have declared that they must have mergers, must put economies into force or private enterprise will be out—that it will be necessary for the Federal Government to operate the railroads as a last resort.

While there has been much talk of mergers, little has been done about it. In the meantime, railroads have been concerned about doing what they can to get their own houses in order. Modern communications has been one approach. Prior to the employment of these techniques it was necessary to man each local station with a telegrapher even though many stations were no more than 5 or 6 miles apart. With the new techniques, the North Western has been eliminating local station telegraphers wherever possible.

When management refused to accede to a job security demand that would require union consent for the elimination of any telegrapher's post that existed prior to 1957, the strike was on.

A similar demand is on file against the New York Central, but an emergency board appointed by President Kennedy rejected it on August 30.

It is possible, under the Railway Labor Act, for the telegrapher's union soon to call a strike against the New York Central. The law requires a delay of 30 days before a strike can start—after the board's report is made public.

In the Chicago & North Western dispute, a Presidential emergency board recommended on June 14, 1962, that the union's demand for veto power over jobs be withdrawn. The board also proposed that the railroad and the union "negotiate a comprehensive program of employee protection."

The union rejected the recommendations. The railroad accepted them.

In commenting on the strike, the Washington Post says:

"By striking the Northwestern the union is attempting to set a pattern which would make it exceedingly difficult for the hard-pressed railroads to institute economies through the elimination of superfluous jobs. Five factfinding boards have rejected the union's demand for a job freeze. One such board said: 'A job freeze is like an economic cancer. It may serve to hasten the end of an enterprise which might otherwise be able to provide more jobs is a healthy economic climate.'"

The President's emergency board proposed a displacement allowance. That is, a worker transferred to a lower paid job would receive for 5 years the difference between the new wage and his former average as a telegrapher. It also called for a furlough allowance—minus any other earnings received. This would continue for 3 years for an employee having 5 to 10 years' service. A 15-year man would get allowances for 5 years. Severance pay in a lump sum also was recommended—and the railroad said it was ready to put the plan into effect if the union dropped its demand for a job freeze.

But the union says that the Northwestern has brought about "an excessive elimination of jobs." It contends there has been no collective bargaining for eliminating a post or as to benefits.

President Kennedy made several appeals for a peaceful solution. The Department of Labor tried to bring about mediation efforts. All legal procedures of the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted.

In the current issue of the U.S. News & World Report it is said that "the administration's final weapon—in the event of a prolonged strike—could be an appeal to Congress for special legislation to bar railroad strikes and require arbitration of the issues—binding settlement by outsiders."

[From the Pierre (S. Dak.) State News, Sept. 12, 1962]

UNNECESSARY RAIL STRIKE

It seems as though the railroad operating unions are trying to turn back the clock. Evidence of this is the costly strike against the Chicago & North Western Railway—a strike that affects Highmore and every other town serviced by the company.

In striking against the method of laying off excess employees they are saying, in effect, that the operating conditions of 30 to 40 or even 50 years ago must be considered the operating conditions of today—despite the enormous technological advancements made in railroading in the modern era.

They seem to be saying, in effect, that all railroad jobs must be maintained even when the need for them has passed and the cost imposed by obsolete work rules has been a major element in bringing much of this vital industry to near-insolvency. And they are saying, in effect, that the recommendations made by a distinguished presidential commission which studied the problem for more than a year should be disregarded. The commission proposed not only a modernization of the work rules, but generous benefits of many kinds for displaced and transferred workers. Apparently, the industry accepted the plan—and the unions will have nothing to do with it.

These seem the only conclusions that can be drawn from current union actions. The strike against the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. is doing immeasurable damage to the economy, to the public interest and to labor itself. For we believe that labor, from Jimmy Hoffa on down, is now weaving the rope that will hang it.

Meanwhile, some things can be said with certainty. One is that no group, whether it be railroad, teamster, newspaper, etc., no matter how powerful, can blatantly ignore

the national interest and get away with it indefinitely. Another is that a depressed industry cannot long be a source of highly paid, necessary jobs, much less those that progress has made useless. A third is that railroads must continue to serve this country. And fourth, if worse comes to worst, the Government would be forced to take them over. No one in his right mind would want that.—Highmore Herald.

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press, Friday, Sept. 7, 1962]

EARLY ACTION NEEDED

Approximately 1,000 members of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers went on strike last week. This idled 15,500 other railroad employees and shut down operations on more than 10,000 miles of track in the nine States in which the railroad operates.

If the railroad and its employees were the only ones affected, this could be classified as just another unsettled dispute between the railroad and its union employees. Unfortunately that is not the case. This strike is so far reaching that it endangers the welfare and economic livelihood of countless innocent people who have no voice in this dispute.

It would be impossible to estimate the economic loss that will be caused by this strike. It is sure to run into hundreds of millions of dollars, and the loss will certainly snowball if the strike is prolonged. Both management and the union have indicated that a quick settlement appears impossible at this time.

Sheboygan is especially hard hit because the only rail service passing through the city is the Chicago & North Western line. Press news stories have told the plight of many local industries which will have to shut down unless this rail service is resumed. Similarly, wire stories have told how the strike is beginning to throttle the economy of the nine Midwest and Great Plains States normally served by the railroad.

The gravest danger of the present situation is that the strike could put some of the industries out of business permanently. When plants shut down, their customers turn to other sources for the products needed, and they might never come back to the industries that formerly served them.

The tremendous economic effect of a strike can well be illustrated by that of the Milwaukee breweries' union in 1953. Breweries in other cities not affected by the strike prospered when beer consumers quenched their thirst with their products during the 2-month period that the strike was on. The Milwaukee breweries have not fully recovered from that strike to this very day because of the permanent loss of many of their former customers.

Besides the frightening economic loss and the inconvenience caused everybody affected, the strike has even created a safety hazard in the areas of the large cities in the Middle West. Thousands of suburban commuters who normally were served by the railroad are driving their cars to work, resulting in the jamming of all highways entering metropolitan areas in the Midwest.

All of which proves that the public interest has been vitally affected by this strike. If there is no legal way to stop it, certainly some new legislation should be adopted by Congress so that nothing like this could happen again to railroads or any other type of transportation affecting the general public.

Obviously better machinery is needed for handling such disputes. Perhaps a special transportation court could be created to settle the issues at stake while the common carriers continue to operate. Certainly some solution must be found for this sort of problem.

Furthermore, we do not believe that the most ardent labor leader could conscientiously endorse an arrangement that would concentrate such unconscionable power in the hands of so few. The very idea runs counter to the democratic principles on which our constitutional Government is founded.

The right to strike is basic in our economic structure which we like to refer to as the capitalistic system of private initiative and enterprise. In the ordinary strike, union and management pit their existence against each other until one or the other gives in; but when the welfare and very existence of many other businesses and thousands of employees are threatened by the strike, and when the welfare and safety of entire communities and States are endangered, a mere handful of men have exercised a power that it was never intended that they should have.

They have, by their action created a statewide, if not national emergency and it seems to us it is time for the appropriate authority to exercise its present powers and bring this serious threat to our economy, to our safety and to our very lives to a halt.

NEEDED: A POLICY OF FIRMNESS AND ACTION TOWARD CUBA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise in full support of Senate Joint Resolution 230 which was unanimously adopted Wednesday by the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. The joint resolution unmistakably warns the Soviet Union and its Communist allies of the Castro regime that the present do-nothing policy of the United States toward Cuba is at an end. The two committees are to be commended for presenting the resolution in a form which requires the President's signature, to make it the law of the land. Both Congress and the American people are far ahead of the President in their willingness and earnest desire for prompt, affirmative, and resolute action to meet the Communist military threat in Cuba. He too will be compelled to take notice of the great concern of Congress as he signs the joint resolution.

It is my purpose today to discuss the great need for Senate approval of the joint resolution and to recommend a course of action to implement it.

The time has clearly arrived for the Government of the United States to confront Cuba and its Communist allies with a policy of firmness and action rather than the present policy of vacillation and tardy reaction. The American people and the peoples of the free world are entitled to a long overdue demonstration of decisive leadership from the President. It will be fatal to continue the present policy of drift, timidity, improvisation and indecision.

TWENTY MONTHS OF FAILURE

The American people were treated to a series of impassioned statements during the 1960 presidential campaign concerning the menace of communism just 90 miles from our shores. We were told that if the then Senator Kennedy were elected President, this threat would be ended. But what has been the record?

President Kennedy inherited a detailed plan which was formulated and developed by the preceding Eisenhower

administration calling for training and full support of Cuba's freedom fighters in their effort to liberate Cuba from its Communist masters. The freedom fighters were promised air and sea cover. But the administration panicked and refused to give the promised air support. President Kennedy announced that it would not be given just as the invasion began. This shocking statement was reiterated twice by the President himself and four times with even more emphasis by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. This announcement virtually ruled out the possibility of any general uprising in Cuba.

Thus the Cuban freedom fighters were abandoned on the shores of the Bay of Pigs and left to be slaughtered because our Government panicked and refused to honor its promises. This was one of the most disgraceful episodes in U.S. history. As a result, our prestige and standing in Latin American countries particularly, and throughout the world generally, reached its lowest point ever. Even the liberal New York Times columnist, James Reston, so friendly to the Kennedy administration, was moved to state of the President at the time:

The confidence in his prudence, his poise, his sense of direction and proportion—so joyfully observed after so long in the allied world—have dropped steeply if they have not been destroyed.

In short, he is the author not only of a defeat but of a clumsy defeat, which he has followed with lectures to the press and to the public, as if they were responsible.

We Republicans refused to make this a political issue, hoping and believing that President Kennedy would profit by this debacle. Unfortunately, the lessons apparently have not been learned.

RUSSIAN TAKEOVER OF CUBA

The almost total poverty of U.S. policy toward Cuba has been highlighted during the past few days as the Russians continue their military buildup and complete takeover of Cuba. Military and other supplies have been sent in vessels owned by our NATO allies and shipped in airplanes coming through Canada. Havana is ringed by military hardware manned by Russians and Cubans. Dozens of Soviet Mig fighters have been shipped in, and the number may reach 200. Military equipment, along with thousands of so-called technicians, are pouring into the island. A Cuban parachute corps will be sent to Russia to complete training. Russian-manned radar checks all aircraft flights, while it is believed that former estates near Havana will be used for rocket launching sites. In short, the Soviet takeover of Cuba is complete. While all this has been going on, the administration has sat idly by doing nothing, waiting for the dust to settle, hoping somehow to muddle through.

ADMINISTRATION'S CUBA POLICY ONE OF INDECISION, IMPROVISATION, AND VACILLATION

In the face of this dangerous threat, we are told by the Kennedy administration that we must wait until the Soviet military buildup in Cuba becomes an imminent menace, and then we shall act, and only then. In short, our Govern-

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD INDEX

CUBA—Continued

Letters

U.S. policy failures, by Edward Freeman, A3503.
U.S. prestige, by Clare Booth Luce, 9713, A4114.

Memorandums

Selected chronology on Cuba and Castro, by Library of Congress, 8702.
U.S. action on U.N. loan, 10303.

Remarks in House

Air and naval blockade, 7921.
American plane: hijacking, 13505, 13506, 13806, 14059, 14329, 14544, 14546, 14551, 14625, 14994, 15268, 15272, 15278, 15279, 15287, 15312, 15386, 15391.
Anniversary of Castro's revolution, 13505.
Anti-Castro invasion, 6497, 6498, 6521, 6904, 6907, 6915, 6987, 7228, 7699.
—barter of prisoners for tractors, 8564, 8570, 8585, 8586, 8806, 8883, 9205, 9342, 9364, 9453, 9805, 11547.
—Secretary Udall's views, 6620.
Boycotts: economic and diplomatic, 6634.
Castro regime: defense by U.S. professors, 8276.
Castro's Cuba: haven for criminals, 14994.
Cigars: halt U.S. imports, 3420.
Committee to meet Castro's demand for tractors, 9532, A4294, A4339.
Communist arms: declare contraband, 15288.
Contradictory policies of United States, 8596.
Criticism of U.S. policy, 7679.
Cuba government-in-exile, 12223.
Cuban Freedom Committee: radio broadcasts, 2892.
Cuban patriots: tribute, 6529.
Diplomatic relations: opposition of resumption of, 15941.
Economic embargo, 14553, 14975.
Embargo: favoring, 11918.
—proposed legislation, 15942.
Exports to United States, 2881, 5661, 11914-11916.
—halt, 10401, 10944.
Foreign aid: effect of our commitments elsewhere prevents action against Castro, 18575.
Guevara, Ernesto (Che): appointed Minister of Industry, 2881.
—visit with Richard Goodwin at Montevideo conference, 17918.
Imports: prevent, 6634.
Military strength, 13505.
Molasses: exports, 10903, 10945.
Monroe Doctrine: application to Cuban situation, 7999.
—invoke, 6679.
Pan American Health Organization: use of Russian jeeps, 20330.
Refugees: aid, 7988.
—bill (H.R. 8291) to aid, 18234.
—International Rescue Committee, 16893.
—resettlement program, 15389.
Role in inter-American affairs: expressing sense of Congress regarding (H. Con. Res. 226), 7982, 8230.
Russia: trade with, 3803.
Russian planes, 14055.
Shipments to the United States: bill (H.R. 8465) to prohibit, 19714.
Smith, Earl E. T.: record as U.S. Ambassador, 2492.
Spanish-American War: anniversary, 2494.
State Department: slow to act on Cuban situation, 7581.
Sugar: distribute quota to U.S. producers, 16930, 17796, 17797.
—exports, 4417.
—quota, 14066, 15382, 15386, 15387.
—shipments to United States through Canada, 6498.
—termination of quota, 8905.
—transfer quota to friendly countries, 4226.
Tomatoes: shipment into the United States, 9685.

CUBA—Continued

Remarks in House

Tractors-for-prisoners proposal, 11229, 11641.
—Indiana citizens try legal methods to prevent, 10899.
—interpretation of Logan Act by Attorney General Kennedy, 11932.
Trade embargo, 16292.
United Nations: aid from special funds, 15758.
—loan, 6867, 8896, 9205, 9343, 9346, 9692, 11829, 16208.
U.S. aid, 18170.
U.S. blockade, 8564.
U.S. diplomatic relations: severing, 108, 302, 308, 340.
U.S. imports: halt, 3773.
U.S. policies, 7987.
U.S. policy: strengthen, 14329, 15272, 15273, 15286-15288.
—weakness, 14055, 14059.
U.S. trade: inaction of Kennedy administration to stop, 19386.
University of Free Cuba: concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 209) to operate, 7988, 8232.
World Health Organization: program, 18172, 18173.

Remarks in Senate

Administration's position: reply to Senator Fulbright, 12683.
American invasion: proposals for, 7110, 7111, 7117.
American newsmen: imprisonment, 6215.
American plane: hijacking, 13306, 13319-13321, 13664, 14483, 14503, 14645, 15224, 15282, 15240, 15403, 15421, 15424, 15440, 15680.
American prisoners: raise issue in United Nations, 5502.
Anti-Castro invasion, 6556, 6562, 6575, 6594, 6800, 6815, 6826, 6866, 6941, 7110, 7114, 11702.
—barter of prisoners for tractors, 8212, 8538, 8543, 8625, 8642, 8661, 8662, 8709, 8710, 8716, 8784, 8952, 9036, 9130.
—reply to Republican criticism, 10336.
—revocation of Eisenhower plan, 10336.
—role of U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, 8500, 8503, 8505, 8510, 8540, 9185.
—Secretary Udall's views, 6556, 6806.
—statements by U.S. officials, 7964.
Anti-Castro revolt, 5934, 6064, 6076, 6219, 6278, 6349, 6453.
Baran, Prof. Paul: praise of Castro, 706.
Blockade, 14483, 17019, 17226, 17740.
Blue, James: incarceration, 10346.
Castro, Fidel: betrayer of Cuban people, 6577.
—Communist background, 6597.
—Communist support, 5348.
—police-state policy, 88, 706.
—policies, 12642.
Castro regime: aid from Czechoslovakia, 7642, 7643, 7840.
—review, 2706.
—rise to power (review), 8315.
—support from Russia and Red China, 7629, 7636.
Catholic priests: expulsion from Cuba, 7788.
CIA: faulty intelligence reports, 6580, 6596, 6826.
Collins, Barbara: flight to Cuba, 2533.
Committee of three to meet Castro's demand for tractors (Eisenhower-Roosevelt), 8540-8543, 8625, 8642, 8643, 8661, 8662, 8709, 8711, 8716, 8779, 8784, 8805, 8952, 9036, 9042, 9130, 9158, 9164, 9168, 9186, 9253, 9281, 9402, 9522, 9722, 9846, 10304, 10323.
Communist aggression, 6562, 6575, 6594, 6827, 6831, 7114, 7316.
Communist infiltration, 2707.
Cuba: role of Eisenhower administration, 10336.
Cuban aircraft in United States, 15422, 15637.

CUBA—Continued

Remarks in Senate

Cuban Revolutionary Council: formation, 4738.
Embargo: establish, 3858, 5191, 10228.
Fair Play for Cuba Committee, 1102, 2227, 2533.
—Communist leaders, 17740.
—Communist support, 5132.
—findings of Senate subcommittee, 6601.
—Investigation by Senate committee, 585, 11757.
—showing of film in Detroit, 18405.
Government in exile, 23692.
Inter-American Defense Board: delegate from Cuba, 3751, 3782.
Military intervention: objections to, 7636.
Molasses: exports, 11331.
—U.S. imports, 10787.
Monroe Doctrine: effect of inter-American treaties, 7478.
Organization of American States: reevaluate role of Cuba in inter-American affairs, 8620.
—urged to take action against Castro, 7317.
President Kennedy's policies, 4860.
Rallying Point for Exiles, 4734.
Refugees: adjust status, 21233.
—work of International Rescue Committee, 17472.
Russian Migs: use against invaders, 10827, 10828, 12320.
Sanctions: invoke, 7297.
Senate Internal Security Subcommittee: investigation, 2351.
Soviet satellite, 6934, 6941.
Sugar: quotas, 4907, 13921.
—reallocation of quota, 5136, 5147, 5171.
—sales to Russia, 5141.
Taber, Robert: flight to Cuba, 2633.
Tractors for Freedom Committee: certificate of incorporation, 9522.
—donate to other countries, 11558.
—return of funds, 12137.
Trade embargo, 15515.
U.N. loan, 10303.
U.S. aid, 14720.
U.S. Armed Forces: use, 13655.
U.S. diplomatic relations: severing, 88, 706.
U.S. imports: halt, 3053.
U.S. intervention: opposing, 11704.
U.S. policy: strengthens, 13319-13321, 13654.
U.S. relations, 16961.
University of Free Cuba, 1293.
What can we do about Cuba? 13059.

Resolutions

Captured airplane, by Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans, A5786.
Embargo, by Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce and Key West Junior Chamber of Commerce, A6560.
Opposing tractors-for-prisoners proposal, by Louisiana Legislature, A4168.
Protection of Americans, by Marine Corps League, Winsted, Conn., 8301.
Recognize responsible government in exile, by American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, A1418.
Tractor deal: American Legion, South Dakota Department, 11004, A4643.
—anti-Communist Pan-American Association, A4014.
—High Twelve Club of Euclid, Ohio, 10490.
—Veterans of World War I, Omaha Barracks No. 1005, A4912.
—Young Republicans of Richmond County, N.Y., 7864.

Statements

Cuba and Containment, by Representative Becker, 8402.
Cuban Invasion, by Prime Minister Nehru, A3234.
Guantanamo Naval Base, by Robert Morris, A7438.
OAS Peace Fleet, by Senator Wiley, 338.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD INDEX

213

CUBA—Continued.

Statements:

Backers for Freedom Movement, by President Kennedy, B780, A3898.
by Edward R. Murrow, 9170.
Chairman Sensing, A4352.

Tables:

Arms Imports, 364.
Sugar quota, 14047.

Telegrams:

Anti-Castro invasion, by Senator Morse, 8575.
Castro's use of Czech equipment, by Czechoslovak National Council of America, A3057.
Supporting President's stand, by James G. Patton, A2758.
Tractors from Tiger Tractor Corp. in exchange for Cuban prisoners, by John F. Somerville, A3870.

CUBAN FREEDOM COMMITTEE, excerpt from pamphlet, A6016.

CULPERSON, OLIN, remarks in Senate, tribute, 11758.

CULLEN, NIALL M., relief (see bill H.R. 7846).

CULLINANE, BOB, article, To Act on Import Threat, A5043.

CULLUM, JERRY W., book review, Consensus of a Conservative, A3070.

CULOMBE, ARTHUR, remarks in Senate, court decision, 11752.

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES. See ARTS.

CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT, remarks in Senate, enact, 1547.

CULTURAL EXCHANGES. See DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

CULTURE. See ARTS; DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE.

CULVER, ALUMNUS (magazine), article, Word from Cuba, 8716.

CULVER-STOCKTON COLLEGE, address, World Peace Through World Law, by Senator Long of Missouri, 12751.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY, ILL., resolution, Embarras river conservation project, by board of supervisors, A0290.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY, N.C., convey certain surplus property to (see bill H.R. 8295).

CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, enlarge (see bills S. 1018*, H.R. 5548*),
Letters, 2816.

Remarks in Senate.
Acquire land, 2816.

CUMBERLAND GLASS CO., article, Demise of, A5794.

CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, Big South Fork provide flood control on (see bill H.R. 2331).

CUMBERLAND (MD.) TIMES, article, "Annie Get Your Gun" Marks Start of Diamond Jubilee of Cumberland Lodge, BPOE, A2342.

CUMMINGS, D. E., article, U.S. Fleet in Transition, A6575.

CUMMINGS, H. J., article, Power Shift in Africa, 12022.

CUMMINS, D. H., commencement address at Western State College, A4336.

CUMMINS ENGINE CO., statement, Diesel Fuel Tax, by Representative Wilson of Indiana, 4240.

CUNEO, ERNIE, letter by, A3404.

CUNEO, JOHN F., article, Empire Builders, A5453.

CUNHA, BUENO, ANTONIO S. See BRAZIL.

CUNNINGHAM, DON.
Articles:
Government Spending, A5562.
Welfare State, 13004.

CUNNINGHAM, GLENN (a Representative from Nebraska)

Address: Captive Nations Week, by Albert C. Walsh, A5778.

Don't Let Time Run Out, by Neil B. Danberg, at Doane College, A5549.

Preserving Private Enterprise, W. M. Murphy, Creighton University, A8184.

Problems and Benefits of Automation, at Nebraska State AFL-CIO convention, by, 21754.

Appointed to Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, 2271.

Appointed on Commission, 8456.

Appointed on committee, 2117.

Article: American Officials in West Germany Wonder if United States Will Stand Firm on Berlin, Washington News, A5437.

A Billion Dollars in Flood Damage Averred, Army Engineers, A5446.

Command Post: First 30 Days, from Air Pulse publication, A1946.

Fifteenth Anniversary of SAC, TAC, and ADC, A1946.

Fulbright Fixation, by Henry J. Taylor, in Washington News, A6465.

In Response to Kennedy, by Henry J. Taylor, A5971.

Kennedy Has Fingers in Too Many Pies, by Richard Starnes, in Washington News, A6468.

Legion Post 1 States Stand—Condemns Fulbright Memo on Officers, A6350.

O'Hare Contractor Payments (sundry), 11242, 11243.

Omaha TV Station To Televis Classroom Instruction, University of Nebraska, A4055.

Our Bill of Rights, from Life Lines, A7321.

Postal Subsidy for Moscow Propaganda, by Lawrence Sullivan, 17818.

Propaganda War: Moscow and the Mail, by Roscoe Drummond, 17818.

Redis Use Mails To Lure Exiles Back to Homes from Washington Post, 17818.

Rich Radicals, Henry J. Taylor, A5432.

Robert A. Bicks and Antitrust Action Against Electric Companies, from the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, A984.

Small Town No Handicap to Genius, by Andre Maurois in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, A2248.

Theorists in Power, Henry J. Taylor, A5868.

United States Must Not Back Down on Berlin, Ike Says, by Charles Lucey, A5968.

Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, appointments to, 9473.

Correspondence between Postmaster General Day and Civil Service Commission relative to postmaster positions at first, second, and third-class post offices, 2923.

Editorial: The Discredited Keynesian Theory Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, A5051.

Praising Speech by Representative Phil Weaver, Washington News, A4557.

This Much We Ask, from the Omaha World-Herald, A5864.

Westchester and School Aid Bill, from White Plains Reporter-Dispatch, A6260.

Who Has Socialism? Omaha (Nebr.) Stockman's Journal, A5033.

Essays: Rural Electrification: Richard Bremer, Sally Roschaert, Sandra Wentworth, A4183.

Letter: contract awarded Malan Construction Corp., 11244.

Fulbright memorandum, by Paul J. Roettelle, Reserve Officers Association, Department of Nebraska, A7003.

Omaha balanced labor market, to Secretary of Labor, Goldberg, by Mayor John F. Cuneo, 12004.

CUNNINGHAM, GLENN—Continued

Letter: soybean crop support loans, from the Omaha Grain Exchange, A5902.

soybean crop support program, from the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa, A5907.

views on welfare programs and excessive taxation, from R. S. Lowe, A1655.

Pamphlet: Prevent War in Germany. Communist propaganda, 17816.

Prayer for Our Country, by Rev. Lloyd Betts, Omaha, Nebr., A236.

Resolution: endorsing bill to stop flow of obscene material, Mayor's Committee for Decency of Baltimore, A4674.

opposing any deal with Castro, Omaha (Nebr.) World War One Veterans, A4912.

Review: "Operation Abolition," by Al Frisbie in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, A879.

Statement: Communist and Other Foreign Political and Cultural Publications, by Post Office Department, 17819.

Table: lawsuits pending against Wallace Co. and/or Malan Co., 11242.

Telegram: soybean crop support program, from Milford M. Beahly, A5907.

soybean crop support program, from Roy E. Hendrickson, A6907.

Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials: create, for relief (see bill H.R. 2468), 654.

Communist arms and ammunition: declare as contraband in Western Hemisphere (see H.J. Res. 590), 21554.

Communist movement: achieve complete victory over (see H.J. Res. 589), 21554.

Communist political propaganda: deny use of U.S. postal service for carriage of (see bill H.R. 9004), 17881.

Department of Small Towns and Rural Affairs: establish (see bill H.R. 6714), 6991.

Equal rights for men and women: amend Constitution relative to (see H.J. Res. 214), 2137.

Federal employees: relating to occupancy of Government quarters by (see bill H.R. 6033), 5297.

safety measures, for relief (see bill H.R. 2466), 654.

Federal land: manage under principles of multiple use, (see bill H.R. 9087), 18653.

Fish and wildlife conservation areas: use for public recreation, (see bill H.R. 77), 36.

Freight cars: insure adequacy of national supply, for relief (see bill H.R. 2467), 654.

Fuccio, Gaetano: for relief (see bill H.R. 7323), 8865.

Government prime contractors: be required to perform at least 35 percent of actual work (see bill H.R. 8051), 12222.

Kamboukos, Panagiotis: for relief (see bill H.R. 6275), 5692.

Mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska: construct and maintain (see bill H.R. 3957), 1834.

Motor vehicles: economic regulation of certain (see bill H.R. 6248), 5691.

Obscene matter: increase punishment for mailing to minors (see bill H.R. 4233), 2136.

Parklands: prevent taking for highway purposes (see bill H.R. 8595), 15314.

Peace Officers Memorial Day: designate (see H.J. Res. 300), 3833.

Police Week: designate (see H.J. Res. 215, 300), 2137, 3833.

Postal field service: appoint on basis of qualifications and experience to positions in (see bill H.R. 8359), 13510.

Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955: amend relative to mail handlers (see bill H.R. 2002), 307.

Postal field service employees: work clothes (see bill H.R. 5439), 3683.

CRIME—Continued

Remarks in House

Racketeering enterprises: conference report on bill (S. 1853), 18814.

Remarks in Senate

Anticrime legislation: analysis of bills (S. 1383-1386), 4010, 4260.

Antirigging bill, 11705.

Bad-check offenses: bill (H.R. 7857) relating to, 20418.

Crimes on aircraft: apply Federal law, 12809.

Crimes in United States: increase in number and cost, 1469.

Crime syndicates: strengthen laws, 1069.

Espionage: bill (S. 1895) to punish crime of, 19048.

Fraudulent business practices: maintain records in Department of Justice, 1729.

Fugitive Felon Act (H.R. 468), 20482.

—proposed amendment, 14036.

Inciting to riot: prohibit interstate travel for purpose of, 8737, 8738.

Increase of major crimes, 15403.

Interstate crime: analysis of bills (S. 523-528, 710) to curb, 1089-1072, 1469.

National Advisory Commission, 1623.

National Crime Commission, 13947.

Organized crime: Attorney General's program to combat, 9525.

—need of modern methods to combat, 3074.

Racketeering enterprises: bill (S. 1658) to prohibit travel in aid of, 13942.

Statements

Federal Police Agency Opposed, by J. Edgar Hoover, A1710.

Proposed Legislation To Combat, by Attorney General Kennedy, 3380.

CRIME AND DELINQUENCY (publication), article, Correctional Problems Courts Can Help Solve, A1282.

CRIMINAL EXPENDITURES. See INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954.

CRISS, SARA, article, Will Whittington, A1004.

CRISTOFARI, MRS. FLORINDA M., relief (see bill H.R. 7819).

CROAKE, THOMAS F., remarks in Senate, confirmation, 20581.

CROATIA, remarks in Senate, Independence Day, 5473.

CROATIAN FRATERNAL UNION OF AMERICA, address, Ground-breaking Ceremonies for New Home Office Building, by V. I. Mandich, A572.

CROCIATA, ANTONIO, relief (see bill H.R. 6157).

CROCKER, CHARLES D., article, Soil Adviser Helps To Keep Country Green, A7185.

CROCKETT, DAVID (late a Representative from Tennessee).

Excerpt from "The Life of Col. David Crockett," by Edward S. Ellis in 1884, A2873.

CROCKETT, ELIZABETH, article, Davy Crockett's Widow, A2737.

CROCKETT, WILLIAM J. (Assistant Secretary of State).

Report on nomination, 2152.

CROFT, A. R., article, He Mends Watersheds, 1982.

CROSBY, RAY.

Articles

Is Nikita Taking Us Into Defense Panic? A2105.

U.S. Industry Swarming Abroad, A4290.

CROWAN, GARY, article, Analysis of the Presidency, A592.

CROWIN, JOSEPH V., letter, Olivetti Co. purchase of Underwood Corp., A2151.

CROOKED RIVER PROJECT, CREGG, remarks in House, extend, 10394.

Remarks in Senate: extend, 10394.

CROUCH, PAUL. See INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954.

CROSBY, JOHN, letter, open letter to, by II Progresso, A2459.

Remarks in Senate, New York Herald Tribune: suppression of articles, 10029.

Articles

Broadcasters Sure to Challenge Minow, A3388.

Crosby Steamed, A3981.

I'm Against Rape, 10029.

Is This Trip Necessary? A4016.

Theater in Flx, 9286.

This Is the Word for Him, 11973.

Tough Talk of Glaring Truths, A3770.

We Teach Juvenile Delinquency, A1726.

Who Says What Is a Stum? A1747.

Whose Air Is It, Anyway? 10029.

CROSLEY, ERNEST L., relief (see bill H.R. 8944).

CROSS, GEORGE P., remarks in Senate relative to, 19295.

CROSS, RICHARD J., letter, Medical school needs, A6848.

CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL. See also FLORIDA.

Article: Would Speed Rockets, A6694.

CROSSROADS OF LIBERALISM, THE (book), book review in the Wall Street Journal, A4619.

CROTALARIA SEED. See AGRICULTURE.

CROUCH, KENNETH E., article, Constitution Oaks, A114.

CROW, JOHN O., article, New Frontier Sees an Indian Bite the Dust, 20430, A6554.

Letter: Indian policies of Interior Department, by Purl Willis, A5657.

CROWELL, RUSSELL, article, Good Union Operations, A2317, A2529.

CROWLEY, CHARLES F., remarks in House, nomination for Football Hall of Fame, 7267.

CROWN ZELLERBACH CORP.

Addresses

Policies, by H. L. Zellerbach, 7783.

Pulp, Paper, and Pioneers, by Reed O. Hunt, 5633.

CROWTHER, RODNEY, articles, Farm Problem (series), A34, A35, A119, A120, A180, A181, A270, A271, A367.

CRUISE, A. J., letter by, A222.

CRUMP, BRODIE, article, David L. Cohn, A4635.

CRUTCHFIELD, CHARLIE, letter by, 7022.

CRUZ, FELINO L., relief (see bill H.R. 6334).

CSUKA, MARIANNA, relief (see bill H.R. 1567).

CUBA.

List: Americans in prison, 11338.

Message from Castro accepting tractors, 9846.

Newsletter: Firm Action Against Castro, by Representative Evans, 14930.

Petition opposing tractor deal, citizens of Oley, Pa., 10217.

President Kennedy's message to Khrushchev, 6319.

Press release: arms buildup, by U.S. Department of State, 304.

Responsibility of Cuba for International Tensions (State Department document), 304.

Text of House Concurrent Resolution 298, 7921.

Text of House Concurrent Resolution 345, 12324.

Text of Manion Forum radio broadcast relative to communism in Cuba, A1783.

Transcript of broadcast in which Senator Capehart interviewed Mrs. Drexel Gibson, 11338.

Addresses

Castro's Cuba, by Charles Warren, A6015.

Communism, by Faure Chaumont, 5343.

Communist Conquest of Cuba, by Carlos Todd, A7114.

Communist Path to Conquest of Western Hemisphere, by Spruille Braden, A1889, A2400.

CUBA—Continued

Addresses

Crisis in Laos and Cuba, by Senator Mansfield, 6804.

Cuban Communism and Its Threat to Americas, by Hall Allen, A5292, A5296, A5400.

Freedom Is Dead, by Senator Goldwater, 6217.

It Could Happen Here, by Juan Jose Taranjo-Gonzales, A5786.

Rising Expectations, by Carlos Todd, A2051.

Tension in the Caribbean, by Carlos Todd, A5934.

Threat to Americas, by Hall Allen, A4932.

Time Is on Our Side, by Senator Fong, 15648.

Tractors for Prisoners Proposal, by Bob Siegrist, A4644.

Tribute to Victims of the *Matine*, by Carlos Marquez Sterling, A2044.

United States, Cuba, and Latin America, by Jaime Benitez, 8178.

University of Americas, by Ted Connell, A915.

We Must Fight To Oust Communists, by Spruille Braden, A1306.

We Should Blot Out Communism in Cuba This Week, by Clarence E. Manion, A2082.

Articles and editorials

Accidental Visit to Soviet Cuba, A2740.

Administration's Attitude on Castro, A8813.

Ambassador at Large for Latin America, A6084.

American Broadcasts, A835.

American Press Can Share Part of the Ignominy of Cuban Flasco, A3250.

Americans Very Concerned, A2877.

And They Call Him "Faithful", A535.

Anti-Castro Cubans Say CIA Imprisoned Them for 11 Weeks, A3222.

Anti-Castro Invasion (sundry), 7115.

Arms Blockade? 7020.

Arms and Latin America, A4511, A4570, A4604.

Bits and Pieces, 10226.

Blackmaller, A3714.

Blank Check, A2614.

Blind Charges Against America Ignore Facts on Castro, A4132.

Blockade Cuba, Legion Chief Says, A6515.

Blood Bargaining, 8709.

Brazil Alarmed, 7317.

Canada Not Encouraging Cuban Trade, A1458.

Canada Woos Cuba, A6938.

Can U.S. Stop Castro?—The Right of Self-Defense, A3258.

Case Study of a Police State, 6941.

Castro Appeals to U.N., A6280.

Castro Betrayed Our Country, 6942.

Castro Cancer, A6514.

Castro Catastrophe, A181.

Castro Controls With Oratory and Arms (series), 10615-10619.

Castrolism Spreading Like Epidemic, A5847.

Castro and Mexico, A1779.

Castro Must Go, by Senator Tower, 19785.

Castro's Bid to Kennedy, A761.

Castro's Blackmail, 9847, 10638.

Castro's Cuba—Revolution Betrayed? A2819.

Castro's Prize, A3280.

Castro's Red Story, 14110, A5688.

Castro's Repressive Acts, 9984.

Castro Should Be Named Pirate, A6333.

Castro Should Teach Us a Lesson, A5247.

Castro Shows True Color, A5511.

Certainly, There Is Cuban Unity Against Castro, A4476.

Chaotic Sugar Trade War, A6806.

Church Is Target of Cuba Reprisal, 7736.

CIA Is Accused by Bitter Rebels, A3806.

CIA Kept Its Secret—Even From the Rebels, A2832.

Communist Satellite, A3042.

"Contain" Castro, or Beat Him? A4175.

Cuba After Castro, A1328.

Cuba and Laos, A3189.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD INDEX

211

CUBA—Continued

Articles and editorials

Cuba Incident and the Rule of Law, 8710.
Cuba Moves Into U.S. Politics, A4371.
Cubana Airlines in U.S., A5154.
Cuban Outrage, A6459.
Cuba Now, America Next, A4134.
Cuban Refugees, A6751.
Cuban Sellout, A3348.
Cuba—S.S.R. (series), 5935.
Cuba Through British Eyes, A3649.
Cure for Castroism Still Elusive, A2967.
Deal for Cuban Prisoners, A3676.
Depth of Communist Penetration, A3846.
Doctor Tells Why He Fled, 15220.
Drive to Ransom Captives Needs Help, 9042.
Duty Abroad to Our Ideals, A511.
Envoy Got Squelched, A6446.
Era of Appeasement, A3377.
False Road to Development, A5749.
Feathering Finger of Fidel, A3641.
Fidel and the Catholics, A7241.
Fidelismo Without Fidel, A2743.
Fidel Scores a Win, A3348.
Firsthand Report on Cuba, A2748.
Florida Importers Push Cuban Trade, A5569.
Freedom's Light Shines Through Fog of Defeat, 7130.
Fullbright Fixation, A6466.
Gibe at Cuba Removed From Proclamation (sundry), A6426, A6427.
Great Castro Robbery, A331.
Guevara's Victory, 16438.
Havana Deports 135 Priests and Accused Bishop to Spain, A7430.
Havana, the Place to Save Berlin, A5777.
Haven for Soviet Submarines, A7658.
Helping the Enemy, A3843.
Herbert Matthews' Writings on Cuba, 8315.
Hijacked Airplane, A5841, A6392.
Hijacking of Airliner, A4378, A4382.
Hotheaded Congress Members Again Make Castro Look Good, A6517.
How Cambridge Flunked First Test, A2984.
How Castro Knives Us, His Dupes, A2984.
How Long Can We Tolerate This? A5776.
How Much More of Castro? A5892.
How the CIA Tail Wagged the U.S. Dog, A6321.
How the Cuban Invasion Failed, 21806, A7039.
How to Put Squeeze on Castro, A6111.
Hungry Cuba, A5887.
Imports Help Communism, A1304, A1438.
Invasion (sundry), 6064, 6279.
—— Errors in Washington, 14830.
Invasion Diary (series), 17905.
Invasion Fiasco, A5296.
Invasion and Why It Failed (series by Hanson W. Baldwin), A6048, A6049.
Is Monroe Doctrine Dead? A3456.
It Is Our Problem, A3350.
It Is Still Blackmail, 9193.
It's Unbelievable, 9253.
J.F.K.'s Prestige Shaken, A3154.
Keating Anti-Castro Program, 3451.
Kennedy Denies Playing a Role in Guevara Talk, A6834.
Kennedy's First Defeat, 6578.
Latin American Newspaper Comments (excerpts), 8805.
Latin Press U.S. for Cuba Accord, 18941.
Let's Pick Friends, A3325.
Let's Step Up the Broadcasts, A1432.
Let's Woo Castro, A3093.
Lively Issue of Castro's Justifications, A3509, A3562.
Make the Break Complete, A2923.
Matter of Realism, A3087.
Matthews Says Reform Not Communism, 8317.
Molasses Deal, 12626.
Moral Duty, 9158.
No Punch, but Neat Footwork, A2807.
Not Our Fight? We Can Lose It, A2809.
Offer of \$1 Million for Capture of Castro Proposed as Answer to Ransoming Prisoners, A5743.
Old-Fashioned Fault Finding, A3319.
Old Mistake Repeated, 9042.
Only Road, 6853.

CUBA—Continued

Articles and editorials

Our Latin Policy, A4751.
Pawley's Testimony, 2461.
Pilots of Migs, 10827.
Piracy by Air Must Cease, A5889.
Plane's Worth \$3.5 Million to Fidel for Flying or Lying, A6076.
Policy on Cuba, A2952.
Post Mortem, 7111.
Price of Cuban Debacle, A5695.
Protecting Presidential Prestige, A4126.
Public Should Protest Activities of Groups Urging Appeasement, A3655.
Reaction of Latin American Newspapers (sundry), 9170-9174.
Recalling Spangler's Forecast, A2766.
Record Set Straight, A7456, A7689.
Red-Bloc Aid to Havana, 7535.
Refugees, A719.
Refugees From Castro, 17472.
Return of Hijacked DC-8, A6511.
Revolution for Export, A612.
Russia, China Using Cuba To Subvert Latin America, 12642.
Russian Jeeps for Castro, A6471.
Russians Run the Show for Castro in Mexico, A1893.
Scores United States on Guantanamo, A6747.
Search for Guilty in Cuban Affair, A2963.
Second "100 Days," A3789.
Senate Investigation of Cuban Fiasco, A2965.
Slamming Doors, 276.
Soviet Goal—Control of World, A45.
Soviet Warplanes, 12529.
State Department Blunder, 8028.
State Department Policy and Arthur Schlesinger, A2524, A2525.
Stop Trade With Castro, 3053.
Take Positive Action, A7090.
Telling the Truth About Castro, A1276.
Ten Reasons Why Communism Is Winning, A2788.
Test of Steadiness, A2981.
They Call It Education, 706.
They Fled Cuba, 17473.
Time To Listen to Smathers, A5435.
Tractors for Prisoners (sundry), 8779, 9187, 11932, A3779, A3801, A3802, A3808, A3819, A3840, A3844, A3845, A3853, A3866, A3880, A3890, A3915, A3919, A3924, A3927, A3977, A3980, A3993, A4020, A4036, A4058, A4099, A4102, A4124, A4128, A4136, A4137, A4216, A4231, A4255, A4260, A4322, A4325, A4353, A4377, A4383, A4386, A4387, A4431, A4461, A4482, A4528, A4577, A4787, A4789, A5234, A5235, A5371.
Trading With Castro, A3713.
Tragic Mistake, 10337.
U.N. Aid, A4089, A4140, A4190.
U.S. Firms Ship Cattle to Castro, A1414.
U.S. Press and the Tractor Deal, A6502.
United States Puts Cuba in Red Bloc, 7581.
U.S. Trade Still Goes On With Castro, A3403.
U.S. Treatment, 7316.
Views of James A. Farley, A4255.
War Called Peace, A3045.
We Must Act, A6954.
We Must Help Cuba Get Rid of Castro, A517.
We Must Intervene, A3549.
We Must Stop This Slide, A3398.
What a Difference 90 Days Make, A2930.
What Goes on Here? A3783.
Who's To Blame for Castro's Rise? A4818.
Witch Hunting Out of Season, A905.
Word From Cuba, 8716.
Workers and Peasants Flee, 15408.

Bills and resolutions

Air and naval blockade: establish (see H. Con. Res. 298).
American airplanes: recovery of, illegally held in (see S. Res. 194).
American property: amend code relative to tax treatment of confiscated, in (see bill H.R. 2033).
Equipment: prohibit shipment of, to (see H. Res. 318).

CUBA—Continued

Bills and resolutions

Government-in-exile: expressing sense of Congress relative to recognition of (see H. Con. Res. 345).
Imported articles: prohibit shipment in interstate commerce, from (see bills H.R. 8485*, 8503, 8546, 8644, 8645, 8689, 8791, 8794, 8801, 8827, 8828, 8848, 8866, 8896, 8903, 8917, 8986).
Imports: express sense of Congress relative to, from (see H. Con. Res. 215).
Inter-American affairs: reevaluate role in, of (see H. Con. Res. 226*-229, 301).
Inter-American Defense Board: exclude from membership of, representatives from Government of (see S. Con. Res. 18; H. Con. Res. 203).
Prisoners for tractor exchange: express sense of Congress relative to (see H. Con. Res. 322, 326, 329, 332, 333, 340, 341).
—— express sense of Congress relative to tax treatment of gifts for (see S. Res. 152; H. Res. 326).
—— urge exploration by U.N. or OAS (see H. Res. 314, 315).
Refugees: adjust status of certain (see bill S. 2637).
Sanctions: impose, under Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (see H. Con. Res. 226*-229).
—— initiate, against Government of (see H. Con. Res. 216, 218).
Sugar: prohibit imports of, from, under certain market conditions (see bill H.R. 761).
University of Free Cuba: establish (see H. Con. Res. 120, 209*).

Letters

Boycotts and Communists, by Frank Keating, A3727.
Commending President Kennedy, by Cuban refugees, A2839.
Communist menace, by John A. Hammond, A5143.
Consistent global anti-Communist policy needed, by Clare Boothe Luce, A4433.
Cuban situation, by James Neal Blue, 10346.
—— Nick Stratas, A3174.
Guantanamo Naval Base, 303.
Hijacked airplane, by N. E. Halaby, A5857.
Hijacking of American plane, by Senator Young, 13654.
Invasion: Senator Gore, 11394.
—— M.I.T. and Harvard professors, 8276.
—— Secretary McNamara, 11395.
Naval blockade, by Representative Stratton, 7020.
New rebels, by Nicolas Rivero, A1878.
Nonintervention, by Representative Zablocki and Milwaukee ad hoc committee, 6915.
Prohibiting trade, by Representative Cramer, 19716.
Protesting tractors-for-prisoners deal (sundry), A3728.
Protesting U.N. Special Fund's approval of agricultural research project, by Representative Monagan, 9379.
Reply to charges of Fair Play for Cuba Committee, by Andrew J. Valucek, A2996.
Revolutions, by R. Kent Fielding, A4122.
Soviet satellite, by Joseph F. Thorning, 7316.
Study of trade policies, by Department of State, 12581.
Tomato exports, by Myer Feldman, 9685.
Tractors-for-prisoners proposal, by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, 11220.
—— Judith A. Cliff, A5073.
—— Charles M. Cook, A6178.
—— Representative Michel, 11220.
—— O. E. Pearson, A2784.
—— D. W. Thorin, 10624.
—— Wisconsin citizens, A4294, A4295.
United Nations loan, by Philip M. Klumnick, 9466.